In compliance with the
Canadian Privacy Legislation
some supporting forms
may have been removed from
this dissertation.

While these forms may be included
in the document page count,
their removal does not represent
any loss of content from the dissertation.

University of Alberta

Writing the Hunt in England, 1558-1649

by

Jean Elizabeth Richardson

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of English

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall 2003

National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Acquisisitons et services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 0-612-88037-0
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 0-612-88037-0

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou aturement reproduits sans son autorisation.

Canada

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Jean Elizabeth Richardson

Title of Thesis: *Writing the Hunt in England, 1558-1649*

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Year this Degree Granted: 2003

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as herein before provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

August 1, 2003

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled *Writing the Hunt in England, 1558-1649* submitted by Jean Elizabeth Richardson in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Professor Edward Berry

28 April 2003

Abstract

This examination of intertwining of hunt culture and literature from the ascension of Elizabeth I to the execution of Charles I is broken into five broad areas. This first chapter is divided unequally into an introduction to the non-fictional aspects of hunting culture, and a discussion of metaphor. The second chapter examines the use of venery in erotic verse from . the often unsigned poems in numerous miscellanies to the profusion of sonnet sequences during the 1590s and beyond. An exploration of poems by William Shakespeare, Philip Sidney, Edmund Spenser and Mary Wroth, as well as Thomas Wyatt, Henry Howard, Richard Barnfield, Thomas Lodge, Robert Tofte and others, establishes a continuing interest in the metaphor of violence. The third chapter documents the hunt's usefulness in explaining political interaction and intimate discourse in comedies and tragedies. A survey of plays by Christopher Marlowe, Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, John Webster, George Chapman, and others makes it clear that predator-and-prey dynamics serve as a prominent model to describe brutal social relationships. The fourth chapter builds on the analysis by establishing similar predator-and-prey dynamics in prose fiction. Key works by Sidney and Wroth anchor the chapter, which also explores less well known early "novels" by George Gascoigne, Lodge, Thomas Nashe, and others. Robert Greene's and Thomas Dekker's serial pamphlets

merge the hunt with the criminal underworld and thus provide further examples of continuing interest. The fifth and concluding chapter argues that the hunt remains an important aspect of our lives and our literature.

This research is a significant undertaking within early modern scholarship for three reasons: it begins with a well documented but little explored cultural pastime, and notes and speculates upon its migration into the world of imagination and metaphor; it uses the major figures and those who have received less attention to create a more inclusive view of writing using this trope; and it allows a glimpse into the violence which is at the centre of most social relations.

Table of Contents

1. Hunting Society and Language	1
1.1 Autobiographical Writing	7
1.2 Hunting Manuals	14
1.3 Metaphor	23
2. Hunting Poems	28
2.1 The Miscellaneous Collections	37
2.2 The Sonnet Sequences	45
2.3 The Narrative Poems	53
3. Hunting Plays	70
3.1 Comedies	72
3.2 Tragedies	84
4. Hunting Prose	101
4.1 The Romantic Quest	103
4.2 Picaresque Pursuit	115
5. Hunting Conclusions	126
Endnotes	145
Bibliography	197

I can not omit [from my discussion of exercise] the hunting, speciallie with running hounds, which is the moste honorable and noblest sorte thereof, for it is a thievishe forme of hunting to shoote with Gunnes and bowes: & grey-hound hunting is not so martial nor noble a game.

From *Basilicon Doron* by James I, 1599

My care is like my shadow in the sun —
Follows me flying, flies when I pursue it.

From "On Monsieur's Departure" by Elizabeth 1, circa 1582

Do I not make myself ... a goodly prey for every wretch to devour? Transfigure yourself into my state and suppose what you ought to do, and thereafter weigh my life and reject the care of murder and shun all baits that may untie our amities.

From a letter from Elizabeth I to James VI of Scotland
Received on February 17, 1587

1. Hunting Society and Language

On the previous page, there are three epigraphs from the writings of Elizabeth I and James I. There is a reason for them not being in chronological order. They were chosen because each of them points to an aspect of my following discussion of the hunt in early modern England. James I wrote *Basilicon Doron* to provide his son, Henry, with advice about important matters in kingship. Near the end of it, he recommends horseback riding as the "most honorable and most commendable games that yee can use" (144) but singles out a specific type of hunt on horseback and with running hounds for even higher praise. I use the quotation because it highlights the actual or realistic hunt and because the sport is associated with the monarch. This link is an important part of the first part of the project. It was a fact of early modern English society that the monarch hunted. What is less well known is that interest in the sport was also a part of most people's lives. Many hunt-related employees facilitated and directed the monarch's recreation. Since most people lived in a rural setting and England was a relatively small country, those who did not hunt directly would have witnessed it. What this accumulation of elite hunters,

employees and watchers shows is that predation was a common event in early modern England. In this chapter more details will emerge about the sport's place in the society.

A letter from Elizabeth I to one of her suitors, the Duke of Alençon, at the end of his final visit to England is the source of the second epigraph. In the midst of detailing oppositional feelings about love, the Queen uses a hunting metaphor. It is not a conventional one, for her persona neither pursues nor is pursued by a lover. Rather, it is her "care" which is a following and retreating shadow. The Queen's allocation of her unhappiness to a predator-and-prey dynamic points to a significant aspect of my project. Far from outlining the sport only as a popular occurrence in the lives of most people in early modern England, I also examine its use as a metaphor in literature. In other words, the well known sport migrated into popular works of the imagination. One of the ways writers described the complex interaction between lover and beloved was to frame it as predation. This aspect will be a large part of the second chapter.

The source of the third epigraph is another letter from Elizabeth to her successor, the then James VI of Scotland. Soon after yet another plot on her life was uncovered, the Queen wrote to him. Her initial weary statement that she is "a goodly prey for every wretch to devour" is quickly followed by a more direct solicitation of his support. She encourages him to show his solidarity with her by joining her in persecution. Unlike the

solitary and anguished lives of human prey, the writer encourages another ruler to share her beleaguered state. Indeed, she equates his friendship with his ability to embrace her victimhood. Elizabeth's use of predator-and-prey dynamics beyond the erotic aspects is the third aspect of my project. Early modern English writers made ample use of predation to describe a variety of intensely hostile social interactions. It is this aspect which will be explored in the third and fourth chapters.

Within this project, there are subtle differences and interlocking meanings in the words "hunting," "predation" and "domination." For example, hunting is not restricted to man's chasing of game but also includes its use as a metaphor for animal-like aggression or subservience. Up until the eighteenth century, predation meant plundering or pillaging but I am using it in more modern sense as the action of one animal (including man) preying upon another (*OED*).[1] Thus this term is used as a synonym for hunting. The sense of one individual (or metaphoric animal) having dominion over the activity of another is often referred to in the following chapters. Since such activity does not involve death but rather differences in power, I use this term to reveal the hunt-like qualities of bullying behaviour.

The epigraphs are from two monarchs who ruled during the period examined in the project, 1558 to 1649. The first date marks Elizabeth I's ascendancy to the throne and thus is an important one. She was not the

first monarch to hunt for her father, Henry VII, was even more keen on such outdoor exercise that she was. What makes her reign (and that of her two successors: James I and Charles I) relevant to the project is that literature flourished under them. It is this combination of a prominent hunting culture and many imaginative examples in the literature which led to this chronological parameter. This fertile period ended with the execution of Charles I. The violence of the Civil War and the rise of a Puritan government led to the destruction of deer parks and a diminishment of hunting references in literature. The contribution that the study seeks to make is to document and interpret of the earlier period's prevalence of hunting amongst both well known and lesser known poets, playwrights and prose fiction writers. Predatory references are so pervasive that I attempted to select only those most apt.

This examination is broken into five broad areas. This first is divided unequally into three parts: an overview of my approach to the subject, an introduction to the non-fictional aspects of hunting culture, and a discussion of metaphor. The second chapter examines the use of venery in erotic verse. Evidence of its use begins with the often unsigned poems in numerous miscellanies but continues with the profusion of sonnet sequences during the 1590s and beyond. An exploration of poems by William Shakespeare, Philip Sidney, Edmund Spenser and Mary Wroth, as well as Thomas Wyatt, Henry Howard, Richard Barnfield, Thomas

Lodge, Robert Tofte and others, establishes a continuing interest in the metaphor of violence. The third chapter documents the hunt's usefulness in explaining political interaction and intimate discourse in comedies and tragedies. A survey of plays by Christopher Marlowe, Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, John Webster, George Chapman, and others makes it clear that predator-and-prey dynamics serve as a prominent model to describe brutal social relationships. The fourth chapter builds on the analysis by establishing similar predator-and-prey dynamics in prose fiction. Key works by Sidney and Wroth anchor the chapter, which also explores less well known early "novels" by George Gascoigne, Lodge, Thomas Nashe, and others. Robert Greene's and Thomas Dekker's serial pamphlets merge the hunt with the criminal underworld and thus provide additional examples of continuing interest. The fifth and concluding chapter argues that the hunt remains an important aspect of our lives and our literature.

This research is a significant undertaking within early modern scholarship for three reasons. The first is that it begins with a well documented but little explored cultural pastime, and notes and speculates upon its migration into the world of imagination and metaphor. The second is that it uses the major figures and those who have received less attention to create a more inclusive view of writing using this trope. The third is that it allows a glimpse into the violence which is at the centre of most social relations.

I am not the first person with an interest in the topic. Edward

Berry's *Shakespeare and the Hunt* analyzes the larger social aspects of the sport as well as Shakespeare's incorporation of the hunt into his work. Two other studies — Anne Rooney's *Hunting in Middle English Literature* and Marcelle Thiebaux's *The Stage of Love: The Chase in Medieval Literature* — deal with literature and the hunt in the Middle Ages. The two earlier works examine a different period and Berry's study focuses exclusively on one writer. Each of these works overlaps with my study, but my analysis explores the presence of the sport in the genres of poetry, plays and prose fiction between 1558 and 1649. The genre approach is best suited to a wide ranging investigation but such an endeavour is not without its critics. David Duff writes that the genre approach "carries unspeakable associations of authority and pedantry" with the associated "sins" of denying the uniqueness of the author and text (1). Duff sees "indications that the resistance is beginning to abate," with anti-generic tendencies giving way to an "aesthetic stance" (1) which allows for civil discussions. One of the critics with whom I share similar views on genre is Heather Dubrow. For her, genre functions as a "code of behavior between the author and his reader" (2) and thus allows each "partner" to act on a set of assumptions. Any approach which relies on dual assumptions is in keeping with my overall aim. Since my interest is in the occurrences of a sport in literature, the movement of one facet of early modern life into another points to a knowledge and an acceptance of assumptions about the sport

and literature. On a more practical level, using genre as an organizing principle is also valuable because it discards authorial and chronological approaches and allows for the division of a vast array of material into suggestive and manageable categories.

The second part of this chapter will discuss English hunting culture through autobiography and hunting manuals. The autobiographical writing — Gascoigne's "My woorthy Lord, I pray you wonder not" and Nicholas Assheton's journal — emphasizes the importance of the hunt in individual lives.[2] The discussion of three important hunting manuals — Gascoigne's *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting,* Thomas Cockayne's *A Short Treatise of Hunting* and Gervase Markham's *Country Contentments: Or, The Husbandmans Recreations* — highlights the continuing desire by writers to share hunting etiquette and lore with newcomers to the sport. The third and final section of this chapter begins the transition to imaginative uses of the hunt by looking at early modern views of metaphor by Gascoigne, George Puttenham, Henry Peacham and John Hoskyns, whose texts are especially suggestive in this regard.

1.1. Autobiographical Writing

Addressed to Lord Grey of Wilton, Gascoigne uses his poem, "My woorthy Lord, I pray you wonder not," to explain why he shot "so ofte

awrie" (2) during a deer hunting expedition. Rather than excusing his lack of accuracy as a temporary lapse in concentration, he sees the incident as a metaphor for other failures in his life. He equates his recent lack of accuracy with a similar lack of success in philosophy, law, and the royal court. Indeed, he does not differentiate one from the other but states that he "shootes awrie almost at every marke" (14). To the modern reader, the alignment of success in hunting with success in life is puzzling since each uses quite different skills: the quick shot as opposed to long and determined application. For Gascoigne and others, hunting and social status were two halves of a perfectly packaged early modern English gentleman.[2] Writing in 1587, William Harrison divides the people in England into four categories: "gentlemen, citizens or burgesses, yeomen, and artificers or laborers" (94). In a further explanation, the author writes that the term "gentlemen" applies to all the social gradations from King to gentry. The importance of hunting in a gentleman's life was clearly stated in two books of the period dealing with the education of the elite young man: Thomas Elyot's *The Book Named the Governor* and James Cleland's *The Institution of A Young Noble Man*. In his lengthy description of the ideal education for a "governor," Elyot recommends hunting for its intense introduction of young men to the rigours of combat (V.70^{a}-74^{b}).[3] In his discussion, Cleland stresses physical exercise but also applaudes the rigours and observational skills necessary for success

(V.222-3). Roger Manning offers a different perspective on the connection between war and hunting. He sees a martially inclined aristocracy as assuaging its boredom with an "obsessive preoccupation with hunting" (5). Although analysts differ about the cause, the result is not in dispute. Many members of the early modern elite had an obsessive interest in the sport. It should come as no surprise, therefore, that Fynes Moryson comments "[n]o nation so [f]requently useth these sports as the English" (477) in his 1617 survey of English (and European) cultures.

If Gascoigne sees hunting as a metaphor for his personal failures in life, Assheton takes the opposite approach. In the journal he wrote for two years starting in 1617, he defined himself as a hunter and considered everything in his life as secondary to his pursuit of game. As a literary document, it is remarkable for its brevity. As a social artifact, this "hasty and extemporaneous record" (Raines ix) is a rare glimpse into the intense vocational interest of a single individual.[4] Indeed, it is surprising that he found a moment to jot down even terse entries because he spent an inordinate amount of time pursuing game near his estate. William Harrison Ainsworth describes the grounds around Assheton's home at Downham as "well-wooded and beautifully broken and diversified" (79) and perfectly suited to his self appointed role of hunter extraordinaire. In his *Meditations on Hunting* (1972), José Ortega y Gasset focuses on the complex reasons why hunting may occupy a major part of such a man's life. For the writer, every human being desires to hunt but only those with

sufficient privilege and position singlemindedly pursue the vocation (32). Although the hunter must be fit and be willing to face hardship and accept danger (Ortega 35), the superiority of the agent (or predator) over the subject (or prey) should not be absolute. The subject should have its chance to avoid capture and death, and indeed it is only necessary in utilitarian hunting that the pursuit be successful. The agent does not hunt "in order to kill; on the contrary, one kills in order to have hunted" (Ortega 110-1). It is the view of a non-utilitarian individual who most closely represents Assheton. To categorize him simply as a focused pursuer would be to give a shallow portrait. On the basis of the evidence he himself presents, he was a complex individual who combined regular church attendance with a passionate interest in "popular amusements and recreations" (Raines xii) such as the hunt and drink.[5] He was not the first man who lead a double life but he may be one of the few who continued to present himself as a Puritan.[6]

Assheton's account is valuable because he kept a meticulous record of his prey: fox, otter, hare, badger and fish. Using the contemporary hunting categories which divided prey into the more prestigious beasts of chase (stags and hares), and less prestigious vermin (foxes, otters and badgers), Assheton's interest is in vermin. There were a number of interlocking reasons for his choice. As someone who enjoyed the solitude of hunting alone, he may have favoured smaller animals which he could

carry. What he did with the carcasses remains unclear, for he makes no mention in his writing of eating even the edible animals on his list. Mentioning that Downham's hall was "adorned with various trophies" (79), Ainsworth offers the possibility that they served a decorative function. Assheton's interest in vermin was also linked to his social standing. As a non-aristocrat, he could not hunt deer in royal forests. Since he did not mention a deer park, the reader could assume that such "royal" animals were not part of his hunting repertoire. In fact, Assheton did mention stag hunts more than twice when he referred to incidents involving aristocrats. In August and September 1617, he watched King James, and Sir John Talbot participate in such hunts. There were even a few occasions when he poached deer. In September 1617, he and others killed six deer in three weeks. The most (in)famous example, however, was in November 1617 when the keeper caught him (and others) with two hinds. Assheton gave him parts of the animals and five shillings to ignore the incident. His inclusion of these less savoury hunting experiences highlights a number of aspects of poaching. The act was not considered a serious crime either by Assheton or his neighbours because not only does the diarist include it but other members of the community accompanied him. This social approach leads to the conclusion that not only did Assheton lack any moral difficulty with hunting an illegal animal but that his neighbours and friends also did not acknowledge any barriers. The one

individual — the keeper — who should have upheld the King's right to the animal did not do so. Instead, he put personal interests ahead of the law. Writing about medieval England, Barbara Hanawalt states that "members of the gentry, clergy and nobility" (176) involved themselves in poaching because they enjoyed the hunt and the additional elements of "stealth, danger, violence, sexuality, and [the] assertion of independence" (192). Most poachers got away with their illegal acts because enforcers were lax (Hanawalt 179) or, in Assheton's case, corrupt.

Gascoigne's poem and Assheton's journal document aspects of the early modern English hunt. It is now important to broaden the narrow focus and discuss the relationship of hunting to the monarch. From the Middle Ages to the end of the seventeenth century, the monarchy and the hunt were indivisible (Berry 3). All three monarchs in the period — Elizabeth I, James I and Charles I — provide ample evidence that the sport was popular at court and served as a recreational model for the elite.[7] Although a long established aristocratic activity, the widespread endorsement of hunting drew much of its validity from scripture. Directly after God made the creatures of the world, He formed Adam and gave him "dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth" (Gen.1.26).[8] Indeed, the "most generally held belief" during the early modern period was that Adam was the first

aristocrat (Kelso 33). A gentleman, therefore, saw his access to game as a right over lesser beings. This belief in inherent dominance was coupled with the concept that animals were "negative" because they portrayed characteristics of "ferocity, gluttony [and] sexuality" (Thomas 40, 41). It was the lack of intellectual control which continued to place animals in an inferior position and was used as a further justification for hunting.

One way to assess the cultural importance of the sport is to examine who takes part in the activity. The short answer is the monarch. William the Conqueror established "a favourable environment for beasts of the chase" (Thomas 200) and his personal pleasure through a system of royal forests.[9] Over the succeeding centuries, these monarchial preserves became "vehicles for enhancing the royal prerogative, buttressing aristocratic privilege, and asserting the dubious doctrine that a persona could acquire property rights over wild animals" (Manning 81). In 1614, Francis Bacon articulates this position when he states that "[f]orests, Parks and Chases ... [are] a noble portion of the King's prerogative ... [and as such are] the first marks of honour and nobility, and the ornament of a flourishing kingdom" (V: 88). While Bacon argued social exclusivity and uncut forests were beneficial for all, the neighbouring population often resented these laws as examples of "royal oppression, avarice, and self-indulgence" (Cyril Hart 23). A system of forest law was frequently applied to protect the monarch's venison and vert (timber cutting) rights against

unlawful hunting, cultivating, grazing, or harvesting.[10] The second method of inhibiting transgression into elite territory was the creation of deer parks. These parks were enclosed with "fences, hedges or walls which not only shut in the deer but were also a visible assertion of ownership rights" (Cliffe 51).[11] Christopher Saxton's 1575-80 maps showed more than seven hundred deer parks and gave rise to speculation that there were more of them in England than in all of Europe (Vandervell and Coles 15).

It would seem that only the entrenched social elite hunted but this was only partially true. It should not be assumed that hunting culture was closed to everyone else, for wealthy newcomers often rose to this more privileged position. It is the second group which is of particular interest here. These individuals needed to present a polished set of elite skills which included a detailed knowledge of hunting practices. It is this group who had the greatest need to read hunting manuals.

1.2. Hunting Manuals

Hunting enthusiasm did not begin in the Middle Ages but it certainly continued into the early modern period. Nicholas Orme sees the hunt as occupying the "minds and bodies of people across the whole of society" (133) throughout both eras. Gunnar Brusewitz notes a shift from the sport being "a fairly barbarous slaughter of every living thing that people were able to lay their hands on" (109) to one in which detailed rules

were worked out about hunting and how it was to be practised. This movement to a more genteel sport marked a change along the continuum of hunting interest rather than an abrupt shift. Rooney states that hunting manuals emphasize the ennobling qualities of the recreational activity for the hunter and the "nobility and special status of the hunt" (12). She is referring to English medieval hunting manuals but there was little substantial difference between a medieval work, such as *The Master of the Game* by Edward Plantagenet, and any of the more modern works. All of them emphasized information about peripheral hunting issues such as game terminology and the execution of appropriate horn signals. Rooney's conclusion is that the English writer's concentration on the non-utilitarian or courtly aspects form a "code" or "barrier" (15) to hunting outsiders. An interest in medieval hunting manuals continued. The first hunting treatise in English, *The Boke of St. Albans,* was published twenty-two times between 1486 and 1616 (Halliday vii). Early modern writers also produced hunting manuals of their own. The content was similar but they differed from their predecessors in a significant respect: they were produced on a printing press. This difference is important because it allowed multiple copies to be made available to wide-range of customers at a relatively inexpensive price. Since each bookseller/publisher was presumably driven by profit rather than altruistic motives, such works as Gascoigne's *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting* (1576), Cockayne's *A Short Treatise of*

Hunting (1591), and Markham's *Country Contentments: Or, The Husbandmans Recreations* (7th edition 1654) are also evidence of an ongoing interest from 1575 to 1615 and beyond.[12]

In her important study on the effect the printing press had on the culture of early modern Europe, Elizabeth Eisenstein does not mention of the hunting manual but she does make general comments about technical literature. She writes that the "advent of printing lessened reliance on oral transmission even while providing powerful new incentives to open closed sketchbooks and publicize the tricks of various trades." The result was "an avalanche of technical treatises and teach-yourself books ... [in which] socially useful techniques could be publicized ... not because of the rise of a new class but because of the advent of print" (2:554, 559). It is Eisenstein's assertion that manuals satisfy the reader with practical and useful information but not necessarily with the tools of social advancement. This seems unsatisfactory when hunting is considered. Ruth Kelso thinks that sixteenth century England can be divided into two groups: "those who lacked the title were busy trying to acquire it, and those who had it were anxious to resist encroachment" (18). Lawrence Stone and Jeanne Fawtier-Stone find evidence that a "steady flow of newcomers from office and the professions" kept the core of older elite families relatively stable (403). In an essay about social changes during the time of Shakespeare, Norman Jones asserts that between 1580 and 1620 a "massive

redistribution of income in favour of the landed classes" (35) takes place and produces a boom in large new country houses and substantial investments in agricultural land. As a result of these changes, Louis Wright suggests that courtiers and citizens sought handbooks or printed guides (122). With the high rate of social mobility, courtiers were often "upstarts" (Wright 122) who needed to increase their skills as befitted their new rank. Citizens were also "ambitious for advancement [and] ... eager for self-improvement" (121). The craving for what Wright calls the "Tudor and Stuart counterpart of the modern fifteen-easy-lessons" (121) was enormous. The manuals performed a dual function: they served as evidence of a self fashioning aspect which has not been discussed by new historicists such as Stephen Greenblatt and others, and they documented a hunting interest by more than just the elite. These volumes seemed destined for the bookshelves of a variety of hunting enthusiasts but there is considerable variation in approaches: Gascoigne's is widely informational, Cockayne's is personal and idiosyncratic, and Markham's is concise.

Gascoigne's *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting* stood out from other hunting manuals because it was the definitive work on the subject. He devotes almost two hundred and fifty pages to aspects of dog care, "fivetene sundrie Chaces" (title page), vocabulary and musical notation.[13] The amount of detail in each section is enormous, with sixteen chapters on numerous aspects of hunting dogs, and close to twenty chapters on the

hunting of the hart. On the title page, Gascoigne states that his intent is to offer "all Noblemen and Gentlemen" everything written about hunting by "the best approved Authors ... And reduced into such order and proper termes as are used here, in this noble Realme of England." The implicit aim of the work was more complex. Always looking for ways to win acceptance from nobles and gentlemen, Gascoigne wrote what he thought would be an indispensable aid. He produced a work which allowed (at least vicarious) entry to anyone with enough money to buy the book. As a social climbing elitist, his work was unwittingly democratic.

Cockayne's *A Short Treatise of Hunting* was written by an adept hunter for his fellow aristocrats.[14] Cockayne wished to "delight" (a term he uses in the subtitle) his social equals. This writer's goal is to remind the elite that the hunt keeps aristocrats fit for "service of their Prince and Countrey in the warres" (A3). Acknowledging that he is without "either eloquence or Arte" (D3), Cockayne writes from his "long [personal] experience in Hunting" (A3). Much as any focused hunter, Cockayne discusses only prey and tactics in his thirty-odd page "pamphlet" (D3). His chapters are on the fox, the hare, various deer (the hart or red deer, the roe, and the buck or fallow deer), the otter and the marten. His ordering of these subjects does not follow the traditional prey hierarchy. He places the fox in a highly unconventional primary prey position. W. R. Halliday thinks that Cockayne is "unique in his appreciation of the possibilities of fox hunting" and adds that "in the modern sense of the art [fox hunting] ...

did not exist" (x) at the time. Cockayne offers insight into a possibly self serving motivation for writing the pamphlet. In his final section of the formal work, he includes an extremely short "special note for an olde man or a lame, that loveth hunting, and may not wel follow the hounds" (D3). Since Cockayne was in his early seventies when he published the work, he argues that those with infirmity can still have a valued place in a sport.[15]

As the younger son from a noble family in decline (Best xi), Markham was an aristocrat and a working man who inhabited "the borderline of respectability and genteel poverty" (Best xii). In 1615 he published *Country Contentments.*[16] It was divided into two parts: *The Husbandmans Recreations* and *The English Housewife* (Best liv). Revisions to the first part of the book occurred many times over the next fifty years and were a testament to the popularity of the subject and the way the author treated it.[17] Unlike Gascoigne and Cockayne, who saw nobles and gentlemen hunters as their readers, Markham had no such expectations. His work is meant to interest his fellow husbandmen who might consider "wholesome Experiences in which any man ought to Recreate himself, after the toyle of more serious business" (title page). In other words, he appeals to individuals who were not part of a leisured class but rather craved leisurely outlets. In "To the best disposed Readers," Markham states that at least one of his aims is to provide inexpensive recreation to satisfy "all vertuous minds" (A2). His appeal to virtuous

minds was a shift from the previous manual writer, for Cockayne wanted to create a healthy aristocrat to serve the monarch in war. Markham had no such concerns. He wished to discuss the leisure activities of hardworking and morally excellent husbandmen. The work marks a shift in the hunt from a full time recreational pursuit to a reward after prolonged labour. In this wide ranging work on recreation, Markham discusses "Hunting, Hawking, Coursing with Greyhounds, and the lawes of the Lease, Shooting in Longbow or Crossbow, Bowling, Tennis ... The whole Art of Angling, and the use of the Fighting Cock" (title page). His chapter on hunting contains an unusual justification. Markham thinks that his audience does not automatically embrace sport. His perspective is that they need help in overcoming an antipathy to pleasure "after the toyle of more serious business" (title page). Citing "heathen Sages or wisemen of the first world" and his own experience of men leading "exceedingly strict lives," the writer states that some "habits or customes of delight" are needed and takes it upon himself to "elect and prescribe what recreation[s]" (2) should be undertaken. Markham allows that the final choice depends on the husbandman's temperament and interest, and outlines "lawful and modest" (3) options. Although Markham gives hunting first position and therefore precedence over other forms, his perspective is different from the previous writers. To him, predator and prey share equal bestial qualities and he grants no superiority to human

intellect. This equality between oppositional forces allows for far fewer assumptions about the final outcome. Markham discusses only two kinds of hunting in any depth: the stag chase and hawking. Generally, discussions of the hunt present him with a problem, since "so much [has been] written of this Subject, that I know not wel what to write, except I should in some sort repeat another mans tale" (23). He quickly recovers from any self doubt and re-establishes (at least in his own mind) the singularity of his less than complete undertaking. Indeed, he states that those who desire "a long continued circumstance" should consult others such as "old *Tristrams* book, translated by Mr. *Turbervile,* and such other Books, where they may find compleat satisfaction" (23). As the "most Princely and royal Chase of all Chases" (23), the stag is the focus of his three and a half page account of hunting and he begins by emphasizing not the thrill of pursuit but rather the nutritional and medicinal properties of the carcass. Markham's discussion of stag hunting is far from encyclopedic but is meant as one of a number of possible recreations. Its brevity is reminiscent of Cockayne's pamphlet but with far less of a focus on pursuit. What remains important about the text is not what it says about hunting but rather that it allows the pursuit to be part of a diversity of recreational possibilities.

These three manuals could not be more different. In the less than hundred years from the first publication of Gascoigne's *Noble Arte of*

Venerie or Hunting in 1576 to the fifth edition of Markham's *The Husbandmans Recreations* in 1654, much of what was accepted as hunting commonplaces had changed. While Gascoigne and Cockayne assumed a mixed audience of aristocrats and gentlemen, Markham aimed to interest working farmers. The shift in perspective signalled a larger change for the latter one was aimed at the small landowner. Instead of a focus on a highly etiquette bound sport appealing to households full of servants, Markham's aim was to awaken a larger, less elite section of the English population and thus his work did not address the interest in etiquette issues such as terminology and hunting calls. His manual moved beyond the exclusive aristocratic model to a more inclusive egalitarian one.

Hunting was a sport which appealed to a wide range of individuals: royalty, the elite, the non-elite who wished to partake in the excitement, the paid hunt facilitator who co-ordinated the enterprise, and, finally, the poacher who took game illegally. In each and every category, there was a thorough and intimate knowledge of venery which validated an interest from the peak of the social pyramid to the bottom. The interest and knowledge of a vast number of individuals within the cultural life of the period is clear but the next aspect to be explored is its movement of the sport into an imaginative world.

In *Society and History in English Renaissance Verse,* Lauro Martines notes that poets (and I would argue all writers) belong to a time

and place and therefore any creative act is likely to bear the marks of a milieu (1). Predation reflected the cultural reality of the writer but its function varied widely within literature.[18] While the rural house or manor signified comfort, security and stability, the forest was a place of unexpected circumstances with the possibilities of suffering and triumph.[19] The unknowable aspects of the world outside the civilized and the predictable brought a degree of excitement to the narrative and heightened the interest of the reader.

If a forest adventure presented the possibility that characters were prey to animals or other people, it also allowed them the opportunity to explore an unknown landscape and to experience chance encounters. Leaving aside the wild beasts which created literal predator-and-prey episodes, it was often the place for chance meetings. But before this aspect can be examined, it should be placed in a context that briefly discusses the role of rhetoric and, in particular, metaphor.

1.3. Metaphor

Rhetoric was important in Greek and Roman education as an aid to litigation and as a technique of political persuasion (Vickers Shakespeare's 83). In England, training in classical rhetoric remained as a central part of the early modern English educational system (Platt 279) and, as a result, literary works should never be seen as "autotelic, self-ending, having no

intention of working or changing their readers' perception of reality or history" (Vickers Introduction 10). Many manuals were published in the period to help writers with the first three steps of rhetorical composition: *inventio* or finding material, *dispositio* or sequencing it and *elocutio* or clothing it in the most effective language (Vickers Introduction 11). Since figurative language was considered part of the initial *inventio* stage, it was not an ornamental afterthought but a part of the work's initial structure. As Gascoigne pointed out in a 1575 primer of English poetry, the "first and most necessary point that ever I found meet to be considered ... [was] to ground it upon some fine invention" (162). In 1589, George Puttenham defined the "*metaphora* or the figure of transport" as a "kind of wresting of a single word from his own right [true] signification to another not of natural, but yet of some affinity or convenience [agreement, congruity, propriety] with it" (242, definitions from Vickers' glossary). In *The Garden of Eloquence,* Henry Peacham describes "metaphora" as the "artificial translation of one word from the proper signification to another not proper, but yet nigh and like" (226). He argues that metaphors give "pleasant light to dark things" (227) by being witty, persuasive and memorable. Moving from the descriptive to the prescriptive, Peacham cautions that metaphors should be based on similarities as well as be in the knowledge, familiarity and moral standards of the hearer or reader. This literary analyst pointed out that a metaphor should serve two

functions: a commonplace linkage within the social fabric of the times, and an insightful moment of light which illuminated "dark things." John Hoskyns echoed these sentiments when he wrote about metaphor in 1599. He thinks of a metaphor as a "translation" and as "the friendly and neighbourly borrowing of one word to express a thing with more light and better note [distinctive characteristic, distinction, excellence], though not so directly and properly as the natural name of the thing meant would signify" (400, definitions from Vickers' glossary). For Hoskyns, all metaphors go beyond the "signification of things" (400) but should not be "too bold nor too far-fetched" (400) and "enricheth our knowledge two things at once, with the truth and with similitude" (401). What makes these comments important is that metaphor has not changed and continues to allow comment on two different realms.[20]

Another aspect of linkage through metaphor was that much of the discussion of predation was done through animal substitution. Both Mary Douglas and Victor Turner touched on this aspect of cultural metaphorical use. For Douglas, the animal kingdom is a "projection or metaphor of [human] social life" (26). For Turner, the fundamentally important way of understanding social relations is to investigate the "foundation metaphors" (Turner 28) of the culture. I extend Douglas's and Turner's investigations to highlight the pivotal role predation served in understanding relationships. Since early modern writers used the hunt metaphorically,

the question becomes: what domains did they intend to link and to what purpose? This is simultaneously a straightforward and complex question. It is straightforward because what is linked is a recreational specific — hunting — and a social specific — domination. What is complex is the purpose fulfilled by such linkage. In one sense, literature and society were (and are) separate. But it is my contention that the hunt serves as a metaphor for underlying tension which spills out most explicitly in literature. The juxtaposition of domination in the form of literary hunting references, therefore, reinforces the "naturalness" of the aggressive predator and the vulnerable prey (Heathcote 174) and, simultaneously, exposes the latent violence of the subordination of the weak by the strong.[21] For the modern reader, the linkage can be disturbing because it creates a highly combative view of early modern English life but it is the type of social interaction which is at its centre. The hunt takes on an importance unwittingly foreseen by Turner when he discusses the "major conceptual archetypes or foundational metaphor" (28). Indeed, its recreational prominence and literary prevalence gives the hunt such a role. A related way of looking at the function of the hunt is to see it as part of a game playing approach to social life. As Clifford Geertz points out, "[s]eeing society as a collection of games means seeing it as a grand plurality of accepted conventions and appropriate procedures — tight, airless worlds of move and counter move, life *en règle*" (518). Predation is

one of this collection of conventional and appropriate ways of discussing troublesome oppositional relationships. Christopher Crocker aptly touches on this view when he discusses the social utility inherent in violence because it allows a society to "handle a virtually unbounded rage of recurrent issues within a single paradigmatic formula" (55). Again, the hunt is that single formula which was used unrelentingly within the period and beyond.

The objective of this chapter has been to lay the groundwork for discussion of the sport of hunting in early modern England. Although my analysis will concentrate on certain genres, it will also bring to bear on those literary kinds a range of writing, such as journals and hunting manuals. The next chapter represents the first movement in an interpretation of hunting primarily in three different kinds of writing: erotic verse, comedy and tragedy, and prose fiction. The following analysis will focus mainly on the importance of the sport in poetry.

2. Hunting Poems

One of the conclusions that can be drawn from the material presented in the previous chapter is that hunting was a prominent part of the daily life in early modern England with widespread participation or interest at all social levels. My interest does not end with this sociological investigation: my main focus is on the transition of hunting into literature. Although I shall analyze three genres, this chapter concentrates on poetry. The miscellaneous collections of poetry, sonnet sequences, and narrative poems published between 1558 and 1649 contained representations of the erotic hunt. The male poets (with the exception of Wroth, all the poets I will discuss are male) focused on the couple, or more specifically, the persona and his perceptions of the beloved. In this small world, the poets used the hunt to describe aggression or, conversely, the misery of being pursued.[1]

Flirtation is similar to hunting because the participants use domination, evasion, compromise and reconciliation. Domination is the active engagement of one individual with a less than eager partner. Evasion is a reaction to dominance in which one individual tries to escape further interaction. Compromise involves a reconsideration of positions by one or both of the parties. Reconciliation reheats the relationship with at least two possibilities: either the dominator becomes more accepting of

equal status or the dominated agrees to the initial terms and acknowledges the subservient role. These stages are in a particular order here but do not imply that there is a particular sequence, that all stages must be utilized, or that the stages do not repeat themselves. One of the few critics to discuss flirtation in these terms is Dorothy Stephens. She argues that flirtation is sexualized play based on "interactive and simultaneous self-fashioning" (16). She goes on to state that it is much more than a series of empty moves because even "symbolic gestures may have literal effects, and play helps structure the world" (16). Much of the interactive and self fashioning aspects of flirtation revolve around the hunt with one partner taking the role of pursuer and the other prey. Incorporating classical erotic hunt elements, early modern English poets followed a prescribed series of steps of infatuation. The lover established an image of female perfection and searched for someone who matched the ideal. As Forrest Robinson puts it, "the lady whose visage enters through the eyes and prints itself so fixedly on the heart ... causes love to appear" (66). Thus, the torments of passion which the lover experienced were "with an object seen within, and not with an actual woman" (Forrest Robinson 66).

Flirtation resembles a predator-and-prey dynamic but there was a more obvious linguistic link in the early modern word, "venery."[2] The word itself is now archaic but it was used from medieval to Victorian times. It meant the sport of hunting beasts and the pursuit of sexual

pleasure (*Oxford English Dictionary*). My objective in this chapter is to examine the connection between these two uses. My task is to develop, through the double meaning, the kernel of this idea and to see its intricate and various expression in key texts. Another term which should be defined is "erotic writing." Ian Frederick Moulton uses the term to mean "any text, regardless of genre or literary quality, that deals in a fundamental way with human physical sexual activity" (5). I agree with Moulton's definition but I use it in a more specialized way. My interest is in the descriptions of these human relationships using hunt terminology. It is the metaphoric hunt which is the focus of much of this chapter. A term which also needs defining is "Petrarchanism." For guidance, I turn again to Dorothy Stephens, because she includes "Petrarch's *Rime sparse* and all the lyric sequences afterwards that imitate the *Rime sparse* to any significant degree" (4) in her definition of the term. The words "to any significant degree" take on a particular relevance. Unlike the earlier French sonneteers who saw eternal worship of an idealized lady as ennobling (Pearson 7), Petrarch complained about his treatment at the hands of an all too human beloved.[3] Within the project, Petrarchanism serves as a shorthand for the pain which is either absorbed or handed out by the partners and which is often described in hunting terms. It is the movement of a psychological tug of war into its actualization as a sport which makes Petrarchanism important. Another term, "courtly love," has an even longer

history. M. H. Abrams traces at least part of the origin of the philosophy of love to Ovid's *The Remedies of Love* (35). In these verses, the classical poet concentrated on strategies to curtail his affection for the beloved, including thinking her severely unkind. This historical link between Ovid and Petrarch is a serendipity but, within the project, Ovid is more important for his story of Acteon's transformation into a stag by the goddess Diana, and the interest the tale held for early modern writers.[4] Ovid was known because, by the sixteenth century, standardized texts were used to teach Latin poetry (Baldwin 2:402) and his *Metamorphosis* was "almost universally required" (Baldwin 2:418) in schools.

What makes the mythological story important is that it explicitly links the hunt with erotic (mis)adventure. Acteon is a hunter who leaves behind the exertions of the chase and his companions to wander in Diana's forest. His brief glimpse of her being bathed by her attendants awakens his lust and her wrath. She transforms him into a stag so that he cannot tell others about the incident. Unable to speak clearly and reveal his identity, his dogs attack and kill him. This is a tale which fits well into Ovid's notions of metamorphosis during encounters between gods and mortals but it also touches on an extreme erotic hunting relationship. One of the ways this type of relationship can be viewed, as Jonathan Hart points out in his discussion of William Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis,* is as a comic reversal of the courtship and gender interaction. Ovid's tale is

cautionary, for it is about the problems which could arise when an individual explores an unknown part of the forest. It touches on the well founded fear of being alone (and helpless) in a dangerous and uncivilized world. This last comment is appropriate to the Ovidian story, but there is more to it than a fear of the unknown, for Acteon moves from a masculine environment in which he is in command to a female territory where he is not. His curiosity about the female-centred area cannot be underestimated and culminates in his symbolic entry into a "cave ... which is moist with spray" (78). Acteon's passage into the vagina-like opening seems more than a haphazardly included detail. His exploration leads him into a space which arouses his interest and simultaneously blocks further entry. A successful hunter and a leader in his all-male community, Acteon's hopes for success and fulfilment in female space are quickly dashed and he becomes the helpless prey to first the goddess and then his own dogs.

Although specifically about hunting and hunters of various sorts, the tale serves as a popular reference for a number of reasons. At its most basic, it is a story about male fears of female adamancy taken to "absurd and pathetic limits" (Jonathan Hart 42 discussing *Venus and Adonis).* There are a number of broader reasons for the interest. Men are considered the pinnacle of creation but the desires and emotions of humans are shown as never far from the animalistic. Although what he sees is an accident, his silence about what is clearly a highly erotic episode is too much to ask. Diana's transformation of him is her way of keeping

him quiet and leads irrevocably to his death. What makes the episode important is the linkage between the visual component of the erotic encounter and its description in text. For later writers, the discomfort involved in acknowledging the erotic in a relationship plays itself out in a desire for control, with the consequence that domination (with or without violence) is prominent. Under the Latin motto of "Voluptas aerumnosa" or Sorrowful pleasure (Green Index lxxix), Geoffrey Whitney's Acteon and Diana emblem is an example of domination in which the hunter can quickly become the hunted. The icon stands out from others in his collection because it is considerably less static than they are: in this image ferocious dogs leap upon an antlered man. The helpless horizontal position of an antlered man at the mercy of fellow animals is in sharp contrast to Diana, who gazes impassively at the action. The emblem gives two messages: patriarchy does not rule (the female figure and not the male is erect and thus in a superior position) and humans are not superior to animals (Acteon occupies the same level as the dogs). The accompanying poem assumes the viewer/reader knows the story and uses the first stanza to give only the briefest of outlines. The moral advice offered in the final part of the poem makes it clear that Acteon gets what he deserves and that all those who allow "their affections [to become] base, / Shall them devowre, and all their deedes deface" (15.11-2). Both the specific and the more general focuses on the destructiveness of animalistic eroticism are

often described by writers in the period in terms of the persecution and pain.

One aspect which interested early modern writers was the complexity of the male and female roles. Acteon and Diana begin the tale as equals. They are hunters but they undertake their pursuit differently. Acteon hunts with other men. It is a group which he dominates, for it is he who decides that their activities should be suspended during the heat of midday. On the other hand, Diana is a solitary hunter. If Acteon's and Diana's approaches to hunting differ, their post-hunt leisure activities are also dissimilar. Forsaking his fellow hunters, Acteon is a solitary explorer in a foreign territory. He prefers exploration to the relative passivity of contemplation and refreshment. In a parallel but oppositional move, Diana forsakes the solitary pursuit and returns to her devoted servants/nymphs who cleanse any hint of sweat and grime from her body. In other words, she moves away from the role of competent and independent hunter to the passivity of a pampered woman. These second stage roles alter yet again during the third (post-transgression) phase of the tale. In the final segment, Acteon (severely handicapped by his transformed body) is unable to take independent action and thus succumbs to Diana's wishes for him. The complex sequence involves movement away from and towards social contact as well as rapid fluctuation between aggression and passivity. Neither the male nor the

female character is fixed in his or her pattern of interaction. It is this fluidity which provides a glimpse into social expectations and literary licence with those stereotypes.

The four intertwined aspects discussed here — the place of man in a foreign environment, the animalistic qualities of humans, the transgressive act of seeing an erotic situation, and the fluctuations in stereotypical gender characteristics — intrigued early modern poets for one reason: they grappled with the relationship between men and women in a fictional setting. In a steadfastly patriarchal society which actively discouraged equality, the female world was disturbing. Phyllis Rackin's discussion of sexuality in early modern society points out that a man's passion for a woman was a "double degradation, the enslavement of his higher reason by his base, bodily appetites, and the subjection of the superior sex to the inferior one" (41). In the Acteon and Diana story, sexual allure was a trap for both of them. Only by remaining strong against its sway could an individual remain intact and not be devoured by his or her rampaging dog-like passions. Forbearance against passion or at least domination while in a seductive situation was the often unfulfilled goal of many Renaissance writers. Indeed, much of the literature within the project closely aligned animals with humans through the use of metaphor.

The Acteon and Diana tale intrigued a number of poets. In "The Sheppheards allusion of his owne Amorous infelicitie, to the offence of

Actaeon," Thomas Watson's persona uses the violent pursuit and murder of Acteon at Diana's behest as a metaphor for his own condition. He, like Acteon, loses himself in his mental suffering at the hands of his beloved. When Watson turned to sequences, he continued to use the tale. In *Hekatompathia,* his persona sympathizes with Acteon and his fate, for he also feels disdain towards his lady. This poet was not the only sonneteer interested in the tale. In *Licia,* Giles Fletcher creates a speaker who sees his beloved as a powerful figure who appears "Diana-like ... [and] [c]ruell in chase, more chaste, and yet more fair" (31.7-8). Acteon is not directly mentioned but the lover's feeling that the beloved is even more extreme than Diana puts her in a very special category. Lodge incorporates the story into *Phillis* to explain the psychological state of his persona. Many of his thirty-one sonnets deal with pursuit, where the persona chases a "savage fairy" (2) and, in turn, his thoughts chase him like hungry hounds. In *Delia,* Daniel uses a persona who aligns himself with a pursued hart in order to describe the disdain of "a Goddess chaste" (5.3) at being the object of his gaze. In an Acteon-like analogy, the persona states that his "thoughts, like hounds, pursue [him to his] death" (5.12).

This story is a good starting point for a discussion of early modern English erotic poetry because it juxtaposes predation and the erotic. Owen Heathcote is one of the few critics to mention predation in relation to erotic dynamics. He observes that the hunt is a metaphor for a lover's pursuit of the beloved as well as a "metaphor for the male rape of woman

and/or of nature" (174). He aptly equates the hunt with pursuit. It is a focused and intrusive activity towards another but it is also important not to view all hunt-related erotic pursuits as a one-sided male to female encounter. As seen in the Acteon and Diana story and in other poems, it is a more complex situation with aggression coming from either gender. The focus is just as often on the male persona's misery at being a prey. It cannot be disputed that predation involves a barely concealed private violence and it is this aspect which is the most disturbing part of the metaphor. What makes it so difficult for the modern reader is that the hunt reinforces the "naturalness" of the aggressive predator and the vulnerable prey (Heathcote 174). In other words, it is the subordination of the weak by the strong which is the basis of the dynamic.

The early modern writers (and their readers) had no such qualms. Indeed, the hunt was a major theme throughout erotic poetry. My analysis will concentrate on a wide range of poetic writing, such as sonnet sequences and narrative poems, but it will begin with isolated poems published in the popular miscellanies.

2.1. Miscellaneous Collections

English poetry was just beginning to be presented to readers during the period and it was miscellanies which provided invaluable exposure.[5]

The fact that no one individual dominated these works most probably appealed to the printer/publisher and the reading public: a printer/publisher cushioned a possible financial loss by providing the reader with variety, and the reader sampled the stream of contemporary work for the price of a single purchase. In the project, miscellanies are important because their popularity allows access to contemporary poetic taste and because they establish patterns of predation which include Cupid and the beloved as hunters. It is these two figures who will be explored in the following sections.

2.1.1. Cupid The Hunter

The first painful pangs of love often came from Cupid's random penetration.[6] In the first (unsigned) poem of *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites,* "A Nosegaie alwaies sweet," the persona speaks of being wounded by Cupid's arrow "full sore" (32). He complains that his "pain and all ... [his] greevous smart, / ful wel you do it know" (39-40) is continuous. In a variation, the lovelorn speaker in "Like desart woods, with darksome shades obscured" sees himself as a double victim: he is struck by "cruell Love" (6) and further by an actively hostile wood. For him, the trees are "fatall shafts" (5) which inadequately hide the "gastly beasts ... [set to] wage ... warre" (8-9) on him. He feels that his courage in facing the

situation is inadequately appreciated or "rewarded" by his beloved. This poem is another example of bodily invasion but differs from others because it relies for its force on the dual hostility of Love and Nature. In the anonymous "The Sheepheards slumber," another persona sees a blood soaked Cupid standing "like a Conquerour" (27) after having fed on men's hearts. In an explicit reference to the homonymic qualities of "heart" and "hart," the persona sees Cupid's activity as directly analogous to deer hunting. In the penultimate poem of the 1600 edition of *Englands Helicon,* George Peele's "Colin the enamoured Sheepheard, singeth this passion of love" begins with a relatively non-anguished lament to the persona's bleeding heart being inflicted upon him by "gentle" (1) or "soft sweete" (5) Love and ends with his death "at *Venus* foote" (16). In "Cupid Proved a Fencer," Francis Davison's persona mistakes Cupid for a fencer who "oft feigns blows and thrusts" (3) instead of the more deadly archer. After Cupid wounds his heart, he realizes his mistake and his doom. This poem is quite different from the others because it combines two forms of armed aggression — fencing and archery — in the Cupid figure. The fencer is an unconventional depiction of Cupid but he does retain his status as a somewhat playful figure who "intends no harm" (4) and feigns wounding the adversary's eyes. The archer is Cupid's more usual designation and he is portrayed as more deadly than usual for he successfully hits a vital organ. The end result of the dual aggression is that it is about pursuit

rather than wounding. Although the persona does sustain a "hit" (8) by poem's end, he does not dwell on his pain. A. W. (in the same anthology) also moves his portrayal of Cupid somewhat away from the traditional. In "Cupid Shoots Light, but Wounds Sore" and his "An Invective against Love," the poet dwells on the outpouring of poison from Cupid's arrow rather than the initial stinging effect. In the first example, the poison creates a "cureless sore" (28) but, in the second, the persona's position has shifted slightly. In the second, he writes about the oxymoronic qualities of the "strongest poisons [which] oft the taste delight" (4) and later that the "poison mixt with sugar so, / ... but as the deep o'erflowing stops thy breath ... brings certain death" (21-4).

Cupid was a prominent presence in the miscellaneous poems. The personas in these works saw him as a matchmaker with weapons, and thus as a less than desirable visitor. For them, he was an armed figure who invaded victims with pointed weapons in order to make love's presence known. Rarely allowed his own voice, Cupid moved the erotic plot beyond an encounter of strangers to a more intimate interaction.

2.1.2 The Beloved As Hunter

Cupid was frequently portrayed as a hunter but he was not the only one who persecuted the lover. It was just as often the female beloved who

singled him out for rough treatment. While Cupid was almost always represented as armed with a sharp weapon, the beloved had a more varied arsenal: weapons, violence, and imprisonment.

The most often used weapons in female aggression were the beloved's eyes. In the psychology of the time, her eyes emitted sharp rays toward her victim/lover. Many personas in the miscellanies describe gazes which range from disturbing to lethal. One of the most benign descriptions of this kind of interaction is in one of Henry Howard's poems ("The lover describes his restlesse state") in which the persona describes "Within her beames / So swete a venom to have found" (17-8). In much the same vein, Davison defines love as the "paradise" (2) of looking into the beloved's eyes and the "internal smart" (4) of a wounded heart in his "Answer To Her Question, what Love is." In Spenser's "Perigot and Cuddies Roundelay," the lover describes being punctured by the beloved's "glauncing eye, / as cleare as the Christall-glass" (27-8). Descriptions of the beloved's aggression can be considerably more dramatic. In *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites*, the persona in an unsigned poem ("A proper sonet, wherin the Lover dolefully sheweth his grief to his L. & requireth pity") describes his beloved as simultaneously conquering and killing his loving heart (55-6). These examples of the beloved's aggression towards and penetration of the lover leads to two conclusions: the beloved was not distant and aloof but a hovering and menacing presence, and she initiated violent gestures. It was the beloved's single-minded focus on wounding

and inflicting pain which made her behaviour predatory.

In these collections, the aggressive beloved was often associated with animal predators. It was these references which re-fashioned the erotic human chase into the animalistic pursuit. The love poems were most often about physicality and thus these references simultaneously underlined the similarities between humans and animals, and pointed to the naturalness of human predation. They did not refer to just any animals. They required a knowledge of a rural environment (albeit an often exotic one) to make them meaningful. Both poet and reader had this knowledge through hunt culture. Most importantly, the importation of animals into erotic discourse was undertaken with a larger goal in mind. It was to emphasize the inequity of a relationship, and to describe a situation in which a bully interacted with the defenseless.

In an additional poem at the end of Tottel's *Miscellany* ("A song written by the earle of Surrey by a lady that refused to daunce with him"), Howard's speaker sees himself as a white lion who is under the unhappy control of a female wolf. It is an odd pairing as the lion is usually the dominant beast during a hunt. It would seem that the lion agrees that these factors pose difficulties for him because by the end of the poem he commits himself to revenge. He states that a "lions hart is for a wolfe no pray, / With bloody mouth go slake your thirst on simple shepe I say" (85-6). The persona's diminishment by his higher status beloved is not directly

discussed. Instead, Howard uses animal predators to explain his persona's difficulties more obliquely. Two unsigned poems in *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites* also put female domination in animalistic terms. In the first poem ("A proper Sonet, Intituled, Maid, wil you marrie"), the persona gives a rare example of a female's erotic interest. During a seemingly casual encounter, the speaker recounts a woman stating that "he yt that have me, wil never be / he that have my maidehed" (3-4). Despite the explicit implication of the overt invitation, the speaker declines her offer because he finds her forthrightness disturbing. He calls her a domineering "cat" who catches and abuses numerous male mice. In the second poem ("The lover compareth him self to the painful Falconer"), the persona deals more explicitly with anxiety about domination. In this poem he sees himself as a falconer who oversees his "soaring hawk" (1) beloved. He states that he feels anguish (caused by a wayward beloved) and joy (caused by her return). Unlike the first persona who rejects the forthright woman, the speaker feels only anxiety over his beloved's independence. In both instances personas witness a diminishment of dominance in the face of a "wayward" woman. The women are presented as predators (a cat and a falcon) who epitomize female uncontrollability.

If poets and their personas worry about the presence of controlling women, they just as frequently describe situations in which their fears have been fully realized and they are subservient to a female presence.

Unlike the death/murder most often associated with the end of a chase, the surrendering of control to the beloved does not always involve a lethal blow. Instead, female domination can result in imprisonment. This loss of freedom can be seen as no less final for the immobilized prisoner. In the broadest terms, the prey's physical and emotional restrictions mean a living death. In Tottel's *Miscellany,* Wyatt's poem ("[W]hether libertie by losse of life, or life in prison and thraldome be to be preferred") outlines just such a situation but with an added complication. His speaker likens himself to a bird who is "within the cage enclosed, / The dore unsparred, [and the] foe the hawke without" (1-2). This "lover's-dilemma" poem fits in the caged lover/limited option paradigm but the outside poses an even greater threat (Rollins Notes Tottel's 2:317). The choice of certain imprisonment or uncertain dismemberment is posed but by poem's end the speaker opts for imprisonment rather than place his trust in "fortunes chance" (21).

These samples of predation in the miscellanies indicate that the hunt was a persistent poetic device. Using the female beloved and Cupid as predatory figures, the poets of short poems portrayed the male persona as a harassed prey. Domination was simultaneously specific and wide-ranging. It was specific because it involved two individuals in an unequal relationship, and it was wide-ranging because it exhibited a number of

different behaviours. As has been shown in the examples set out here, poets often saw the relationship between superior and inferior as hunt-related but not necessarily ending in a kill. Instead of death or submission being the culminating act, they also included incarceration and psychological immobilization in their venery-like model.

One of the key ways English poetry was introduced to early modern readers was through miscellanies and they are valuable as a means of gauging poetic devices, especially hunt-related approaches. So far, the analysis has dealt with isolated love poems in a number of anthologies and they have been looked at to find what they have in common. This same approach will be used in an analysis of the sonnet sequences published in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Rather than discuss the popularity of any one sequence, I shall consider it a given that the sheer abundance of English sequences points to the subgenre's engagement with the popular imagination.

2.2. Sonnet Sequences

Sequences are written by one author and (most often) use a single beloved but they are united by little else.[7] They are separate and discrete poems with only position on the same page holding each fourteen lines together. It is the amorphous quality which makes general remarks about the entirety of any one sequence difficult. Seen as a poetic subgenre, the

sequences are important in establishing not only the presence of a hunt-related theme but also variations in approaches from the poems in the miscellanies. They differ from the previous form because they contain fewer appearances by Cupid and make far less use of the beloved's penetrating gaze. They do continue to establish themes of penetration, invasion and domination.

2.2.1 Cupid The Hunter

References to Cupid were not as extensive in the sequences because most sonneteers chose not to include him. Instead, they created a much smaller two-person universe with only the beloved and the lover. Despite the diminished use, Cupid did not completely disappear. His most prominent appearances was in Wroth's sequence where he served as a surrogate for the largely absent beloved. In the dream vision which begins the sequence, Cupid invades the persona's body and replaces her heart with one that is "flaming" (9) with love. By the seventieth sonnet, the lover is ready to kill the chained Cupid for his misdeeds. Unfortunately, Diana's nymphs release him and he escapes (in a very deer like fashion) into the woods. Wroth is the writer who uses the mythological figure most prominently but there are others who refer to him. In *Astrophil and Stella,* Cupid is an erotic predator in an internally linked part of the

sequence (19, 20, 21 and 23). In these sonnets, Cupid pursues a fleeing Astrophil, pierces his heart, and ensnares him in love. Constable writes about the same figure and in much the same way in *Diana*. Griffin uses a pair of sonnets (22 and 23) to deal with this figure in *Fidessa*. The speaker chastises the "ungentle gentle boy" (22.1) for oppressing him and proposes that he chase him in order to make amends for attacking his beloved. In the following poem, he elaborates on his position by giving Cupid instructions. Using an epistrophe (each line ends with "her heart"), the persona earnestly envisions Fidessa with a besieged heart to match his own.

2.2.2 The Beloved As Hunter

The alignment of the beloved with predation continues in the sonnets but there is a slight shift in usage. Only a few sonneteers —Barnes, Daniel, and Wroth — refer to her knife-like gaze. They do not relinquish interest in establishing the pain of love but focus instead on the more intense internal pain of a heart's movement from one partner to another. Although the approach may seem medical, it should be seen as erotically-based predation. Unlike the superficial wounding of a short-term relationship, the movement of the heart is considerably more intense. In Tofte's *Laura,* the persona moves slowly towards the declaration that his

heart has been a focus of his beloved's interest. Beginning with an oblique reference to his "poore afflicted bodie" (1.2.2), the speaker makes it clear that it is the "cruell" (1.6.5) beloved who steals his heart and leaves him depleted and partially disabled. This is unlike the position Wroth presents in *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus*. In her sequence, the lover requests the beloved's heart be sent to replace her own (30.10). In the exchange, the lover loses her own heart (which is perhaps her goal from the beginning) and gains control of her beloved's. The control allows her to dominate him and thus to portray herself as the victor. As seen in this example, the theft of a heart is not always negative. In Richard Barnfield's *Cynthia,* the persona on two occasions emphasizes the lack of despair and the pain he feels about the beloved's intrusion. In the first sonnet, he speaks of being the prey to the beloved/thief who steals his heart. Far from feeling ongoing pain, the thief's action creates only a feeling of absence in him. The other example in the sequence occurs in a dream when he watches his beleaguered heart bleed profusely. Instead of being concerned, Barnfield's persona feels rejuvenated. Spenser reverses the theme by describing the persona/lover's invasion of the beloved. In the *Amoretti,* his persona enters the beloved's body and places his heart in her bosom. The persona emphasizes the positive aspect of having his heart "gently encage[d]" (73.10). Not surprisingly, the lover, or rather his "speaking" heart, is ebullient and fulfilled as he learns to sing her "name and praises over all"

(73.12).

Although the creators of sonnet sequences used the penetration seen in the miscellanies and moved beyond it to bodily invasion, they were far less experimental in their use of dominating animals. Like the anthologized poets, they employed animals to discuss the inequity of the erotic relationship. Thus, predatory domination based on venery continued to describe a situation in which a bully's interaction with the defenceless was the norm. In this world, the female beloveds were described as a wide range of animal predators. Barnes's persona is not the only lover who sees his beloved as a domineering figure. He is the one who repeatedly aligns her with predatory animals. In *Parthenophil and Parthenophe,* he describes her eagle eyes and her bear or tiger heart (102.10). Spenser's persona is no less awed by his beloved's power. In the forty-seventh sonnet of the *Amoretti,* the persona embarks on a vivid description of the beloved's enthusiastic pursuit, capture and dismemberment of her lover/prey. This sonnet is an extreme statement of destruction but one that Spenser uses again in his fifty-third sonnet. In the poem, his speaker sees the beloved as another predator — a panther — whose spots attract his attention and make him vulnerable to attack. Not surprisingly, the lover bemoans his personal "decay" (53.7) at the hands of the panther who is without "mercy" (53.8). Unlike the passive panther in

the earlier poem, this tiger is more active, and pursues a blood trail to find a suitable "feeble prey" (56.4). These two sonnets (53 and 56) should be seen as a pair which link similar predators and make similar metaphorical leaps.

Sonneteers did not always write from the predator's point of view. Quite often, their descriptions focused on the prey's fear of large cats, fishing hooks, hunting beloveds, or imprisonment. The drama of predation by large cats interested more than one sequence writer. The speaker in Griffin's *Laura* sees himself as prey "unto a cruel [female] tiger" (59.1) whose "ever cruel" (59.5) personality keeps him perpetually "fit to suffer death as she to kill" (59.11). In Tofte's *Alba,* the persona feels surrounded by fierce wild tigers and ravenous lions (1.23.5). When the predation intensifies in the next section, he states that his "smart" (2.5.2) is being aggravated by a "bloodie Lion or a stinging Snake" (2.5.1). No less popular were descriptions of the lover's impalement by fish hooks. Barnes describes his lover as a fish caught in Love's golden hook while in *Laura* the lover refers to "curteous Love" (3.6.3) successfully fishing for him. In the *Amoretti,* Spenser links the beloved's "smiling looks" (47.1) with fishing, for they act as bait on "golden hooks" which attract and kill "foolish fish" (47.3-4). Captivated by his beloved's beauty and modest looks, the lover in William Alexander's *Aurora* calls these attributes "[t]oo pleasant baites ... [which] hide ... [the] poison'd hookes" (14.11) of "crueltie" (14.9) and pride (14.10). Another variation in the cluster of prey-

focused descriptions is the lover explicitly links himself with the traditional hunt. In Sidney's sequence, Astrophil sees himself as the victim of a "[d]ear killer" (48.13). This term is simultaneously an example of word play on dear/deer and a reference to the dual meaning of venery. The persona in Bartholomew Griffin's *Fidessa* uses a series of hunting situations to highlight his feelings of being "the captive crying evermore" (13.8), a "weeping wounded hart, / Moaning with tears the period of his life" (13.9-10) and, finally, as a boar "that will not feel the smart, / When he is stricken with the butcher's knife" (13.11-12). By the end of the poem, he reveals that he feels similar to but separate from his examples because they "live to die" while he dies "to live in care" (13.14). Tofte's persona in *Laura* also feels victimized, when a "fowle black Dog with ugly shape" (2.9.2) follows him. His response is to return to his beloved who is dressed ironically in mourning black (2.10.1). No explicit connection is drawn between the dog and the beloved but it is possible that the dog is meant to represent her on a subconscious level. The poet's interest in the type of pursuit does not diminish. Later, he makes a more conventional reference about his persona being pursued as a deer by his mistress/hunter. The pursuit is soon over and the deer/lover is "shot, hit, [and] taken" (3.15.6) by her. A more passive form of predation by the beloved is capture and immobilization. Sidney speaks of incarceration when he describes Astrophil's brain as "captiv'd in [a] golden cage" (23.11). A more common

method is restraint using the beloved's hair. Constable's persona speaks of his entrapment in the beloved's "curlèd knots" (2.8.6), while Spenser's complains that the beloved's golden tresses are the artful "snare" (37.6) of a cunning individual.

Predation was as frequent in the sequences as in the miscellanies. Poets continued to use the same terms to detail the beloved's cruelty and the lover's psychologically distraught state. But there were subtle alterations. Cupid's pursuit of the lover was still present but not with nearly the same force as in the miscellanies. The beloved's wounding glance had also diminished. These changes did not mean that sonneteers were uninterested in violent erotics. Rather they exchanged the wounding in the single poem for more violent methods. Far more invasive than a relatively minor external wounding, the degree of invasion of one partner by another was profound. Another change was the use of captivity as a form of domination. Again, as in the examples of bodily organ/penetration, imprisonment was a more extreme form of domination because it inhibited movement rather than being only psychologically intimidating. These two shifts in approach were important because they showed that innovation did play a part in predation usage. These sonneteers' search for novelty led them to incorporate more extreme measures rather than less. What is clear is that they shared the view of the

poets in the miscellanies. Their portrayal of interpersonal sexual dynamics was far from a straightforward mimicry of patriarchy. These poets and sonneteers were reflections of the Petrarchan dynamic since they were working within a society dominated by male power. They did not show slavish obedience to duplicating patriarchy in their work. Instead, each of them explored possibilities which were far from what they saw around them.

The erotic poets discussed so far held remarkably similar positions (with nuanced differences) about the hunt's usefulness in outlining male pain. This focus, however, was not universal. Some writers, and in particular Shakespeare, set out to tell a story rather than reveal internal agony.

2.3. Narrative Poems

Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* (1593) and *The Rape of Lucrece* (1594) are not the same as the poems in the miscellanies and the sonnets in the sequences. Both of these works were longer and more complex but, most significantly, they were a continuous story, complete with narrator, characters and incidents. They moved away from the segmentation of shorter poems — even those within a loosely linked sequence — but they also shifted. Shakespeare turned his back on the preliminary rituals of

penetration or invasion dynamics between the lover and the beloved. Instead of focusing on the pain of initial contact, Shakespeare makes domination and the hunt fundamental parts of his poems. He accomplishes the goal by creating a narrator who assigns predatory and prey labels to the characters. Since these two poems offer a complexity of predation usage not seen in the previous poems, I provide here an analysis that is more detailed than that which has appeared beforehand.

In both *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece,* the narrator acts as a filter between character and reader and thus comments on, describes and influences the interpretation (Jonathan Hart Narrational 65). In the first poem, the narrator preys upon Venus. This misogynistic narrator's goal is to wound her, and the weapons he uses are predation metaphors. This interpretation of the narrator puts into perspective an aspect of the poem noticed by several critics (Belsey, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, J. S. Hart, Hereward T. Price). They see a discrepancy between an easy-to-follow plot and the fascination with which the reader absorbs the poem. Coleridge perhaps says it best when he states that "you seem to be *told* nothing, but to see and hear every thing" (70). Coleridge does not pinpoint the mechanism but Price does. He thinks the plot is made as easy as possible so that the reader can absorb the images (108). It is the images, or I would argue more specifically the metaphorical images, which are at work. It is also these same metaphors which are the most damaging to Venus. At the beginning of the poem, the narrator aligns Venus with

predators of the air and Adonis with victims closer to the ground. His first metaphoric reference to Venus is to call her an "empty eagle" (55) in search of a victim. This focus carries over to his descriptions of her entrapping Adonis in her arms like "a bird tangled in a net" (67), enfolding him "like a band" (225) and imprisoning his hand in a "jail of snow" (362). The narrator's alignment of Venus with imprisoning aggression escalates as the poem continues. By approximately the middle of the poem, the insistent foreplay by Venus escalates into possible intercourse. I use the word "possible" because only Robin Bowers (of the critics I consulted) thinks that the kiss is actually coitus (9). The language used does tend to obscure intimate details from the reader and so it is an open question whether Bowers is correct. What is clearer is that the predation imagery used by the narrator for Venus reaches a new level of intensity. He portrays her as feeding "glutton-like" (548) on "yielding prey" (547) with even her lips becoming "conquerors" (549) and drawing everything from her victim. A few lines later, he labels her a "vultur" (551) and then proceeds to create a grotesque portrait of a woman in the midst of sexual passion. The description of her face as reeking and smoking (557) is particularly odious for it is a visual representation of her loss of control. My discussion here is of Venus but it should be noted that her alignment with animals is usually followed closely by a similar usage for Adonis. At this point in the poem, he is simultaneously likened to an overhandled

wild bird (560), a roe or deer tired of the chase (561) and a fretful child quieted with "dandling" (562). The unifying principle here is passivity induced by human interference. In the series of metaphors, Adonis is a wild bird used in falconry and thus under the owner's control. He is also the roe pursued by hunters. The alignment of Adonis with an infant made passive by adult playfulness is particularly poignant. It is an exaggeration to see Adonis as an infant but he is made passive by the largely unrelenting aggression by Venus. Immediately after the encounter, the narrator makes it clear that Venus is not sexually satisfied. He does this by portraying her as a nameless bird pecking at "painted grapes" (601). Belsey discusses Shakespeare's use of the false image elegantly in her essay on the subject but my interest is in the narrator's reason for using such a device. This trompe l'oeil comes from Pliny (Roe footnote 110) and breaks the narrator's alliance of Venus with carnivorous birds. Indeed, she is no longer a carnivore but a hungry vegetarian. The reader may feel some sympathy for her but she can also be seen as foolish, for she cannot tell the difference between an authentic grape and a painted one. Her perception of what to eat (or whom to pursue for sexual purposes) is not discerning. At this point in the poem, the narrator tells the reader that Venus understands her defeat with Adonis but it must be noted it is not a self-revelatory comment by this character. What is clear is that Venus reverses somewhat (or at least postpones) her role as sexual predator, to become a

verbal bully. Venus receives her most surprising animal association from the narrator during her morning search for Adonis. The urgency with which she scours the area for Adonis is likened to a lactating doe trying to find her fawn (875-876). This is a surprising alignment because all of the Venus/animal references up to this point have been ungendered. Not only is the reference to a female animal but it is decidedly maternal. The shift towards mothering is a radical departure because Venus has previously shown only erotic feelings towards her "fawn" (876). As if these factors are not enough of a departure in the narrator's depiction of Venus, her association with a doe makes her one of the animal species sought after by aristocratic hunters. She is no longer a forceful conqueror but rather a parental defender with a high probability of early death. At this point in the poem, Venus is a subdued erotic being who assumes the protective colouration of motherhood. Except for the startling admission that she would rather have killed Adonis before his fatal attack by the boar (1118), the guise of erotic motherhood is the one left at the end of the poem. Even her cutting of the transformed Adonis/flower and pressing it to wither on her breast seems simultaneously domineering and mothering.

In the second poem, *The Rape of Lucrece,* there is only one hunt: the sexual predation of Lucrece by Tarquin. It can also be seen as a carefully constructed tableau directed by the narrator. He is a hunter whose prey is Tarquin and his goal is to wound this individual with predation

metaphors. Even the atmosphere-creating descriptions of nature are loaded with Tarquin's alignment with predators. The night when Tarquin moves towards Lucrece's room is described as silent except for the "owls' and wolves' death-boding cries" which are meant to surprise the "silly lambs" (165-167). Later, when he is at the threshold of Lucrece's room,"[n]ight-wand'ring weasels" (307) serve as a reference to his movement. The weasels referred to may be a realistic touch by Shakespeare, for they were kept in houses to catch rats and mice (footnote, *Riverside,* 1820) but they also highlight Tarquin's predatory behaviour. In even more pointed references, Tarquin is described as both a night-owl (360) and a serpent (362) as he walks to her bed. His extended blazon of her about-to-be-conquered body is described as that of a "grim lion" (421) fawning over its prey. In an interesting twist, even Tarquin's knife is compared to a falcon about to swoop down and destroy a fowl (505-509) as it hovers over Lucrece. In the extended moments before the rape, the narrator steps back briefly to offer single stanza directions to the reader on how to interpret the interactions between the two characters. Not surprisingly, the comments demonize Tarquin and eulogize Lucrece. In lines 540-44, the narrator characterizes Tarquin as a mythical cockatrice and a gripe while revealing Lucrece as a "white hind." The choice of these particular metaphors alters, at least temporarily, the predator-and-prey dynamic. By aligning Tarquin with mythical creatures and Lucrece with a

traditional object of the aristocratic hunt, the narrator is stepping outside the realistic environment of the poem. By doing so, he lifts Tarquin into a mythic demonic universe while keeping Lucrece as a rank and file prey. It is a somewhat odd juxtaposition and one that is not repeated. The metaphors may be unusual but the message is not. The narrator tells the reader how to understand the scene. He immediately returns to more pedestrian metaphors by calling Tarquin's dalliance with his prey that of a "foul night-waking cat" (554) to Lucrece's "weak mouse" (555). David Willbern suggests rather puzzlingly that the rape occurs simultaneously "between stanzas, in lines 683-84" (194). The *Riverside* edition of the poem does not break the stanzas either directly before or directly after these lines and, so as Willbern suggests, the rape may happen here. What is clear is that it is an extremely oblique reference which could be missed by a less than astute reader. The narrator does not allow for such a possibility. He briefly stops the action and gives directions to the reader. In a concentrated set of metaphors focused solely on Tarquin, he describes him as a "full-fed hound" (694) and a "gorged hawk" (694) to indicate the deed is done. Only after the aside is complete does the narrator turn his attention back to Lucrece by including her in the juxtaposition of "thievish dog" (736) and "wearied lamb" (737). It is significant that these metaphors are the last ones supplied by the narrator. They are somewhat oddly linked because dogs do not usually attack lambs. Indeed, lambs are more often paired with the wolves (677 by the narrator and 878 by Lucrece). This dog

reference is most likely used to link Tarquin with the earlier "full-fed hound" (694) reference.

While the narrator of both *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece* can be considered predatory with a clear view of which character he views as his prey, the characters themselves can also be seen as hunters or pursuers. In *Venus and Adonis,* Venus is a hunter and her prey is the sexual gratification she desires from a young boy. It should be said that Venus herself is not a young girl. The exact age of a goddess is impossible to calculate but her level of seduction experience would lead one to presume her a mature (or more than mature) woman. She portrays herself as without a single wrinkle (139) but her human form should not be confused with her age. This poem, then, is about a highly sexual older woman's attempts to seduce a child/man. It is simultaneously a comic seduction (Jonathan Hart *Till Forging* 42) and an exploration of "transgressive sexuality" (Bate 88). As Hart points out, Venus's unrelenting verbal attempts to persuade Adonis "strains logic to justify lust" and "creates comedy ... [that] comes close to absurdity" (41). Bate sees Venus's active role as transgressive because it dissolves "the conventional barriers of gender" (88). Venus's actions define much of her relationship with Adonis but she also occasionally uses metaphors to describe her own behaviour towards him. Early in the poem, Venus characterizes herself as a park with Adonis as her deer (230-40). Since an

Elizabethan deer park was a place where death was a certainty (Berry 51), it is not surprising that Adonis greets her remark with disdain. No further details about his reaction to her remarks is provided but it is possible that he sees the metaphor for what it is: thinly disguised aggression. Not only is Adonis aligned with a hunted species but he is also imprisoned in a park. Venus's attempt to win Adonis by intertwining the aggression of the hunt with the tranquility of the pastoral is a failure. Venus's second alignment of herself with animals comes when she tries to persuade Adonis to abandon his plans to hunt the boar. What is clear is that Venus becomes a verbal bully. Initially, her change in tactics is straightforward and self-interested: she wants Adonis to change his hunting plans. Since she senses his intransigence, she pursues a fascinating analysis of the inherent dangers of boar hunting while aligning herself with the fellow aggressor. In her discussion of Love and Jealousy (649-660), she sees herself in conflict with the boar for Adonis's affections. I agree with Venus that boar hunting was a dangerous sport but the metaphors she uses are a cause for concern. The desire of Venus to rule Adonis and the boar's desire to kill him are both strategies to obliterate his identity. Adonis is silent on this issue as well as on many others throughout the poem. It can be seen that his love of the boar hunt is a way of attempting domination which he is unable to accomplish in any other way. This is the reason why he tacitly rejects Venus's suggestions that he pursue more "fearful creatures" (677) such as

the fox, the roe, and particularly the hare. For him, these creatures are the victims like himself and thus unacceptable for pursuit. The third time Venus associates herself with animals is when she mythologizes Adonis at the end of the poem. Her description of the awe animals feel for him seems at odds with his recent death by the boar. This lack of realism (both in his interaction and in the type of animal inhabiting the forest) must be overlooked. What is important is that Venus describes him at least partially as an individual who interacts with animals rather than someone who describes himself as an animal. She seems genuinely grief stricken by the fact that her pursuit of him has been curtailed. The interlude is short lived because she once again identifies with the boar. Her desire for penetration and his death leaves her unfulfilled. The word "kill" is not listed in either of the recent glossaries of Shakespeare's sexual terms by Gordon Williams or Eric Partridge but it seems likely this is what is meant. The possibility makes it a complex remark, for Venus crosses a double barrier to transform herself into a male animal. In the last moments of the poem, Venus (and not the narrator) reveals herself for what she really is: a masculine predator.

Adonis is a predator, for he defines himself as a boar hunter, but this is not a poem about his exploits. His interest in his chosen activity cannot be disputed but his competence can be questioned. The reader does not see him engage in the activity, except for the one encounter which results

in his death. One of the problems of assessing Adonis's abilities is the difficulty in determining his age. Is he a young adult who seriously pursues the boar to simulate war (Merrix 350 quoting Thiebaux Mouth 284) or is he a boy who mimics adult activities? It seems that he most likely fits into the latter category for Adonis describes himself as an "ungrown fry" (526) and too "early pluck'd" (528). Venus (and the narrator) describes him as a boy a total of nine times. Venus also calls him "unripe" (128) and "hairless" (487). Most artists portray Adonis as a young adult but this is not how he is depicted in this text. Adonis sees himself as a serious individual in pursuit of the goal or quest of killing a wild animal and he uses no metaphors to describe himself as a hunter.

In *The Rape of Lucrece,* Tarquin is a hunter and his prey is Lucrece. As a military man, he embarks on a campaign towards a goal that leaves as little as possible to chance. He gains access to Lucrece's household and then proceeds with his rape plan when few servants are present and Lucrece is asleep. His interest is not seduction. He does not try to talk Lucrece into a sexual act and indeed there is little dialogue between them. Tarquin speaks a great deal in the first half of the poem but it is an internal monologue dealing with his justification of the impending act. His own assessment is that he is not a hunter. Indeed, he uses "hunt" only once (267) as a verb. This single use is as a rhetorical question about why he should bother to "hunt for color [glossed as pretext, *Riverside* 1819] or excuses" (267) about his planned behaviour. The turn of phrase sums up

his lack of interest in subjecting his intentions to anything approximating scrutiny.

Venus and Tarquin are victims of narrational disdain but it is Adonis and Lucrece who are the real victims. Adonis is the focus of both Venus's and the boar's aggressive instincts. As the only victim in *Venus and Adonis* who can speak for himself, he tries to provide a series of reasons for his non-compliance. He pleads his youth (415-20 and again 524-28), his dislike of love (413-14) and his wish to be alone (785-86). His final response is to lecture Venus about the difference between love and lust (769-810). What is clear is that Adonis sees himself as countering her verbal aggression with his own verbal offensive. When the counter strategy fails, he moves away from his pursuer. We do not see his interaction with the boar but we can assume that words are not used. In the weapon-to-tusk combat, the boar's only offensive strategy is to attack the hunter. The metaphoric descriptions of his role as victim are left to the narrator.

Lucrece's predominant role is as prey of Tarquin's aggression. The word "prey" is used four times (342, 421, 677 and 697) and in each case the narrator is speaking of Lucrece. The reader (thanks mostly to the narrator) sees Lucrece in this role but it is difficult to know whether she sees herself the same way. The problem is that in the crucial first half of the poem, when she is most obviously the prey, she says little. Even her arguments with Tarquin at the point of the rape are stifled by her own "nightly linen"

(680). After the rape and Tarquin's flight, it is her time to speak about her situation and she does so at length, frequently using animal metaphors. Directly after the rape, Lucrece considers her husband's reaction to her changed status for she sees herself only in relation to him. Thus, she considers herself a hive robbed by a wasp (836-840). This allusion is followed quickly by three quick contamination metaphors: a worm intruding into a bud (848), cuckoos hatching in sparrows' nests (849) and toads infecting mud (850). The intense section concludes with an allusion to an adder hissing at (and presumably attacking) birds (871). These images of violation and contamination follow easily from the predatory victimhood she has endured. Lucrece continues to use predation in her apostrophe to Opportunity. She berates Opportunity for setting a wolf upon a lamb (878). The metaphor reveals her situation in the context of opportunity in nature. While her preceding string of metaphors focus most commonly on thievery or contamination, this one is about annihilation. She uses the metaphor to emphasize her vulnerability and relative weakness compared to her predator. The wolf and lamb metaphor is used also by the narrator but this is the only time Lucrece uses it herself. Lucrece's third and final use of animals to describe her situation is in the apostrophe to Time. In a resurgence of contamination metaphors, she sees herself as a white swan with a "stain upon . . . [her] silver down" (1012). This metaphor shows a clear change from earlier contamination

metaphors, for no longer is the "disease" or blight hidden. It is now external and visible. She does use an eagle (1015) for self definition but she does not indicate a newly assumed predatory role. Its use indicates that Lucrece views herself as occupying an elevated social position in which her actions are noticed by everyone in the community. She feels that the position makes her all the more vulnerable.

Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* (1593) and *The Rape of Lucrece* (1594) differ from the poems in the miscellanies and the sequences. This writer turns his back on the preliminary rituals of penetration or invasion dynamics between the lover and the beloved seen in the miscellanies and sequences. Instead of focusing on the pain of initial contact, he makes the hunt a fundamental part of each of his poems. He accomplishes these goals by creating an opinionated narrator who describes the characters as predator and prey.

The inspiration for much of the poetry came from earlier writers: the erotic hunt in Ovid's writing, and the persecution in Petrarch's poems. Knowledge of these writings as well as hunting culture in England meant that their predatory references were obscure neither to early modern poets nor to their readers. This poetry focused unrelentingly on gender relations and predation.

Poets wrote widely about the pain of relationships and at no point

did the hunt disappear from the literary arsenal of the period. In the miscellanies, Cupid and the beloved worked in concert against the lover. Separately but with the same goal, they poked and prodded him into misery. These two figures performed similar functions but the beloved was more often described metaphorically as a ferocious animal. In the sequences, Cupid made fewer appearances but the predatory beloved remained prominent. Sequence writers intensified the predation by moving beyond poking and prodding. In these poems, surgery involving the heart became a commonplace. The alignment of the beloved with fierce animals remained constant as much in the sequences as in the poems in the miscellanies. What altered was that the sonnets were also written from the perspective of the beleaguered prey. In his two narrative poems, Shakespeare used predation which was similar to but different from the miscellanies and sequences. One of the ways it was similar was that he saw gender dynamics as inherently predatory and used an extensive metaphoric structure to support this view. His use was dissimilar because each of these works had a narrator. It was the storyteller who conveyed his views of the predatory characters to the reader. Although many of the same predator/prey animals were used by Shakespeare, it was no longer a world in which the beleaguered persona/lover described either his predatory beloved or his suffering. In his narrative poems, Shakespeare's fictional world was widened considerably with the addition of a knowing

and opinionated third party: the narrator.

Appearing as often in miscellanies, sequences and narrative poems, the hunt accentuated the violent confrontation between men and women. There was little sense that either gender won. Even those written by the single female sonneteer (Wroth) did not glory in victory but rather displayed a persona significantly cowed by her experiences. The single exception to the masochism was in the poetry written by Barnfield in his male/male adoration sequence, *Cynthia*. This persona used the hunt but stopped short of anguished masochism. For him, the bond between himself and his beloved was rejuvenating rather than debilitating. Barnfield must be acknowledged as a significant exception. For the most part, the attraction and antipathy exhibited between the genders offered a glimpse into the workings of early modern cultural dynamics.

It becomes problematic when one attempts to gauge how much the violent metaphor reflects an underlying animosity between the men and women in the period. It can be said with certainty that the society in early modern England was patriarchal and thus metaphors relating to the domination of women were commonplace. It is a surprise, therefore, that these predominantly male poets dwelled on the anguish of being persecuted, for there was little joy or triumph expressed. For the gender "winners" in such a society, the erotic seemed to have little to recommend it. The objective of this chapter has been to establish the prevalence of

venery in the poetic writing between a lover and a beloved. The next chapter presents the second movement in the interpretation of hunting. It will focus on the importance of the sport in comedies and tragedies.

3. Hunting Plays

The analysis of the hunt in erotic poetry suggested that predation was a major component and that early modern English poets linked the erotic with pain. This chapter will expand the discussion to plays and, in particular, comedies and tragedies.[1] I rely on early modern literary theorists to supply their own definitions of comedies and tragedies. Drawing on the classical view of comedy, Thomas Heywood sees it as "a discourse consisting of divers institutions, comprehending civil and domestic things, in which is taught what in our lives and manners is to be followed, what to be avoided" (493). Philip Sidney underlines this thinking when he states that comedies are "an imitatio [imitation] of the comon errors of our life, which [the playwright] representeth in the most ridiculous & scornfull sort that may be: so as it is impossible that any beholder can be content to be such a one" (E4). John Harrington puts it most succinctly when he says that comedies make "men see and shame at their own faults" (313). If comedies focused on portraying and thus attempting to eradicate individual flaws, tragedies had a more widely based social agenda. Sidney feels that they "sheweth forth the ulcers that are covered with Tissue, that maketh Kings feare to be Tyrants, and Tyrants manifest their tyrannical humours, that with sturring the affects of

Admiration and Comiseration, teacheth the uncertaintie of this world, and uppon howe weak foundations guilden roofes are builded" ($E4^V$). Heywood echoes these sentiments when he writes that tragedy represents "only the cruel and lawless proceedings of princes, moving nothing but pity or detestation" (312).

Comedies and tragedies used three forms of predation: the actual, the erotic and the social hunts. One of the differences between writers for the stage and poets is that playwrights must establish a setting for their characters. The actual hunt in plays takes place in either a rural or an urban setting. In its rural setting, it was an outdoor activity for status participants. In its urban setting, it was a nefarious activity for criminals. The actual hunt was a major component in the comedies of the period but no less important were the erotic and social hunts. Compared with its equivalent in poetry, the erotic hunt was lighthearted and flirtatious. Comic playwrights did poke fun at characters and one of their targets was anyone who was overly focused on predation. Tragedians used the hunt differently. They were not interested in the actual hunt as a form of scenery but rather used it to show underlying social tensions. Their erotic hunt was far from the comic equivalent for it was decidedly lopsided in favour of the lustful predator. Since tragedies revolved around either unequal social relationships or the downfall of one leader and the rise of another, these dramatic changes were often described using predator-and-

prey language.

3.1. Comedies

3.1.1 The Actual Hunt

The hunt in comedies served as a place for chance meetings, rescues and pursuits.[2] William Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew*, for example, opens with an interrupted hunt and thus the woodland setting is a suitable environment for the unnamed Lord, and a place where he meets a troupe of travelling players who will perform the "inner" play. The fourth act of *Love's Labor's Lost* contains similar activity for the Princess and her entourage. In *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, Shakespeare's interest increases and he begins the play with John Falstaff's killing of one of Robert Shallow's deer. Thomas Dekker uses the hunt in *The Shoemakers' Holiday* in much the same way as Shakespeare does in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*.[3] Both of these plays deal with poaching. In Dekker's play, Masters Hammon and Warner pursue a deer to the Lord Mayor's summer residence in suburban London.[4] The placement of this residence is significant for it confirms his wealth but not his status. He is not an aristocrat and thus he and his household probably do not have hunting rights to the property.[5] Their behaviour confirms this assumption. When a

deer jumps the property's fence and runs into the Lord Mayor's barn, his servants kill it. Not only are they ill equipped for the task (they use a flail and a prong) but they do it quickly to avoid detection. This deer, in a sense, is doubly stolen, for it is chased onto the property by one set of illegal hunters and dispatched by another. When the first group arrive to inquire about their prey, they are met by two women. As the more active participant in the recent deer killing and the one with a much lower status, Sybil has more to lose by being truthful. Indeed, Rose warns her that the hunters will "have a saying to you for this deed" (6.15). Since poaching was a serious offense, it is Rose who takes the initial steps in misleading them.

The status of hunting activity and by extension the hunter himself is evident in *As You Like It*. Orlando is a competent and useful hunter and thus his skills are an important element of the plot. It is he who rescues his brother from a hungry lioness in the last scene of the penultimate act and thus this episode increases his status as a worthy (and marriageable) individual.[6] Ben Jonson goes one step further when he uses the sport to define aristocratic masculine behaviour in *Epicoene*. In that play, Sir Amorous La Foole states that a man is someone who consumes a "brace of fat does ... half a dozen of pheasants, a dozen or two of godwits, and some other fowl" which he eats with his family and a "great lady or two" (1.4.45-6). The post-hunt milieu marks a contrast between the boisterous and highly social behaviour of wealthy individuals and Morose. Unlike the way men usually spend their time, Morose stays indoors in an attempt to

escape the noise of the city.[7]

When Lysander (and his friend Tharsalio) set out to test the virtue of his wife by falsifying reports of his death in *The Widow's Tears,* the experiment is predatory. Even the messenger (Lycus), who delivers the news to Cynthia of her husband's "death," feels that these two men treat her as a hunted animal. He states that "men hunt Hares to death for their sports, but the poore beasts die in earnest: you wager on her passions, but she takes little pleasure in those earnest passions" (4.1.31-4). Lycus continues his analysis of the situation when he applies the term "Venerie" (5.1.41) to the seduction of the grieving Cynthia by Lysander (posing as a soldier). His analysis rests on the dual meanings of venery (seduction and hunting) and thus pinpoints again the predator-and-prey qualities of the pursuit. As well, it is an ironic situation. Lysander is an illegitimate predator of his wife and a cuckold. While a successful hunt can elevate an individual's status, the opposite is true when predatory victimhood is the playwright's focus. In the last scenes, Lysander serves as the object of a search by his fellow soldiers. Their "fresh Hare" tries to stay ahead of the "tir'd hounds" (5.4.1-2) and resorts to "hunting obscure nookes" (5.5.24) to escape. Even Lysander's explanation for the disappearance of the crucified body that he is meant to be guarding is based on the hunt. He states that he has heard that the body has been removed by "two huntsmen, to feede their dogges withall" (5.5.144-5).

The rural setting and the hunt was an appropriate backdrop for rural aristocrats but playwrights also used the hunt to explore London society. Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair* is a particularly apt example since his exploration of thieves and vagabonds at the notorious summer fair brings new meaning to prey pursuit. Many of the characters are openly predatory. The banter between Jordan Knockem (the horse courser) and Ursula (the pig woman) centres on his multi-faceted predation. She knows him for his "cutting [of] halfpenny purses, or stealing little penny dogs out o' the Fair" (2.3.10-11). Despite her seeming disdain for his work, she is not above being an accomplice in his activities. By the fifth scene in the second act, she joins forces with Ezekiel Edgworth (the cutpurse). Her part is to use her "hawk's eye" (2.4.52) to mark his targets. In another example of predation, Cokes shows considerable enthusiasm for all of the wares shown at the Fair and begins to buy them enthusiastically. Despite Wasp's warnings that it is a "springe" (3.4.115) or trap, he continues. Cokes's reputation as an easy mark is fixed, for he is soon the prey of Nightingale/Costermonger and loses his sword, cloak and hat. The details of this convoluted plot do not transfer easily into a synopsis but what can be said is that predation is rampant. One of the few critics to notice this theme is Arthur Kinney who sees the play as "stuffed with images drawn from hunting and falconry that underlie its repeated dramatic cycles of predator and prey" (Introduction to *Bartholomew Fair* 487).

In comedies, the actual hunt served a realistic and a metaphoric function. Since the rurally-based aristocratic plays required an activity and a setting, the hunt provided the characters with something to do which was appropriate to their status. Most of these playwrights also used predation for its metaphoric possibilities. The sport pointed to class differences and the norms of gender behaviour. Perhaps its most important metaphoric function was in the description of urban society. Comic writers used the hunt to portray the aggressiveness brought about by poverty. The split between how the hunt served writers who portrayed the rural and the urban did not end with the actual hunt. It continued to be a way to describe differences in the male and female characters.

3.1.2 The Erotic hunt

The erotic hunt in comedies set in a rural area differed from the one described by poets. There was an occasional mention of poetic elements — penetration, organ exchange, Cupid, Venus, or Acteon and Diana — and most often it involved an equally knowing couple and their pursuit of each other.[8] This type of predation was prevalent and so intertwined with the actual hunt that it can be difficult to keep the two separate. The fourth act of Shakespeare's *Love's Labor's Lost* is an example. The Princess "comes to hunt ... in the park" (3.1.164) with her entourage but she pursues two

kinds of game. She is an avid hunter who is openly flirtatious with the forester. Thus she links her desire to "spill / The poor deer's blood" (4.1.34-5), with the possibility of attention from her male "admirer." She resembles Diana since she is a predatory female with a bow who pursues prey but there is a difference. Her skills are on display for an even more important erotic prey. Shakespeare presented an even more complex intertwining of hunts in *As You Like It* with the relationship between Orlando and Rosalind. The first moment Celia sees him she notes that he is "furnish'd [dressed] like a hunter," which indicates his role in the actual hunt. Rosalind's reply that "he comes to kill my heart" (3.2.245-6) moves him into the erotic category. Rosalind's cross dressing makes this hunt complex for there seem to be two individuals (Rosalind and Ganymed) taking the beloved's position when in fact there is only one. In other words, Rosalind moans about the destruction of her heart but she just as vigorously pursues her own invasion and destruction of his heart.

Another example involves Rose and the household's poaching in *The Shoemakers' Holiday*. As an experienced and coquettish woman, she decides forthrightly to blur the lines between the actual and erotic hunts. Her first answer to questions from two hunters about "their" game crossing the property is to refer to "two does" (6.17). Her remarks slowly spark their interest in amorous possibilities. Hammon feels pursued by Rose and is far from displeased by her strategy. He states "I chased the deer; but this dear chaseth me" (6.36).[9] It is clear by the middle of the

scene that homonymic playfulness involving deer/dear and heart/hart dominates both sides of the conversation.

The rural erotic chase often rested on the mutual attraction of equally knowing partners but its urban equivalent was considerably less lighthearted. In this type of hunt, the goal of the male aggressor was to improve his status and simultaneously demeans the female object of his "affections." An example of this type of urban eroticism is Volpone's designs on the married Celia. Volpone speaks of his desire in poetically acceptable terms — he is Cupid's victim — but these remarks barely disguise his lust for the beautiful young woman. Coupled with her husband's greed and her unwillingness (at least initially) to break her matrimonial vows, this is a particularly sordid example of the heterosexual chase. James Shirley's *The Lady of Pleasure* offers an example of a similar erotic chase. One of the young widow's suitors, Alexander Kickshaw, makes his predatory views obvious when he refers to her as a high status bird: the pheasant. His alignment of her with prey goes further when he wonders aloud whether he should "bring up the Pheasant / And waite, or sit at table uncontrould / And carve to my owne appetite?" (3.1.136-8). Although he ponders delayed or immediate "consumption," his position as predator does not change. Indeed, one of the more common presentations of the urban erotic hunt is the unequal relationship between a widow and her suitor. Since a widow (in all probability) is wealthy as a

result of her previous marriage, she is the ideal catch for an impoverished social climber. The disparity between his wish to "marry up" and her possible disdain for "stooping down" is evident in *The Widow's Tears*. In this play, Tharsalio pursues the none too pleased widowed countess, Eudora. When the suitor declares his love, she equates him with her hunting dog and suggests that he occupy the kennel (or gutter) outside her house (1.2.72-4). Far from being deterred, Tharsalio pays no attention to warnings about the inherent danger in pursuing the unobtainable. The mercenary erotic chase of a widow is also present in *Bartholomew Fair*, when the courtship rivalry between (the appropriately named) Winwife and Zeal-of-the-Land Busy over "possession" of Dame Purecraft forms an initial predatory theme. This rivalry between the two suitors is intense but fleeting. By the fourth act, Winwife and Quarlous move on to another prey, Grace Wellborn.

Predation in the erotic hunt followed much the same division as its actual equivalent. In the rural erotic comic hunt there was less of a sense of domination than of flirtation. This hunt was more a game between consenting adults than anything more ruthless. The same cannot be said of its urban equivalent. Aggression and domination were very much the agenda of every urban predator. Since these male characters most often pursued wealth and status, their targets were often widows. It was this mercenary aspect which is at the heart of this hunt. Comic playwrights did

not stop at the depiction of this specific kind of social interaction but rather broadened their use of predation to include critiques of society to form a social hunt.

3.1.3 The Social Hunt

Using predation, comic playwrights frequently took a critical stance. Focusing on either a particular character and society in general, they targeted desirable hunting behaviour that was less than desirable. An example of direct comment on an individual hunting devotee appears in Jonson's *Every Man In His Humor*. A "country gull" (folio version 9), Stephen mimics what he feels is gentlemanly behaviour. When first introduced, he is looking for a "book of the sciences of hawking and hunting" (1.1.33) to tell him what to do with his bird of prey. He justifies his new interest by stating that if "a man have not skill in the hawking and hunting languages nowadays ... [h]e is for no gallant's company" (1.1.41-4). His purchase of a bird without knowing much about the sport is foolish because he must now borrow money to understand it. Throughout the play, he continues to try to enhance his transformation into a gentleman by making various purchases.

It was common for writers to aim their critical remarks even more broadly. Shakespeare comments directly on hunt culture in *Love's*

Labor's Lost, As You Like It and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. In 4.2 of the first play, Dull, Holofernes and Nathanie offer pretentious and quarrelsome comments on a nearby deer hunt. The scene is a denigration by those who have only enough knowledge to comment inadequately on aristocratic pursuits. These comments reveal at least two things about the average theatregoer and Shakespeare himself. The playwright assumed that the audience knew enough to appreciate what (to us) is arcane hunting terminology. Shakespeare's comments also show that the playwright possessed a superior form of knowledge to create a scene lambasting its lack in others. He uses predation and social commentary in a slightly different way in *As You Like It*. Orlando, feeling his banishment means that he now "feeds with his [brother's] hinds" (1.1.19), aligns himself with deer and reveals his sense of diminishment in his newly restrictive setting. The similarly banished Duke Senior shares Orlando's animalistic feelings. Perhaps out of empathy with an animal which is a fellow victim, he feels a conflict over whether they should hunt and kill for "venison" (2.1.21). More specifically, he states that it "irks me the poor dappled fools, / Being native burghers of this desert city, / Should in their own confines with forked heads / Have their round haunches gor'd" (2.1.22-4). The Duke questions the inequity of the hunt in this situation but one of his entourage (Jaques) goes further. In a reported occurrence, Jaques weeps over a dying deer and uses it to put his own life in

perspective for the audience. In a sequence of statements, he uses anthropomorphism to discuss his own sense of sacrifice, loneliness and isolation.[10] Anne Barton sees these two intertwined scenes as evidence of "tender-hearted [courtiers who] ... worry about preying upon the deer in the forest" (Introduction to *As You Like It* 399) but this is only partially true. What makes these scenes important is that they juxtapose the playgoer's expectations about aristocratic actions concerning the hunt with the reality of the characters on stage. Shakespeare extends his use of predation in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* to comment more sweepingly on a rural community. In the opening episode, the playwright constructs a happy scene in which many residents receive Falstaff's ill-gotten venison. Shallow (the "owner" of the animal) is far from jubilant, seeing Falstaff's generosity as a confiscation of his property. This scene is important because it highlights the community's class conflicts. As a member of the gentry, Shallow is a justice with employees, deer, and his own lodge. As a "courtier manqué" (Joscelyne 57), Falstaff illegitimately claims a higher status and deliberately sets out to disrupt Windsor society.

Jonson uses the hunt in *Volpone* to level criticism against society.[11] In his "first great comedy" (Barton *Ben Jonson, Dramatist* 105), he makes direct comments on society through his depiction of a predatory gift exchange. On one side, a supplicant gives a gift to a "dying" man in the expectation that "it shall then return / Tenfold" (1.1.80-1) on his death. On the other side, the "enfeebled" Volpone increases his wealth. At least part

of Jonson's social comment lies in the lopsidedness of the explicit predation references. Volpone is forthright in his assessment of his supplicants. He sees them as "Vulture, kite, / Raven, and gorcrow, all my birds of prey, / That think me turning carcass" (1.2.88-90). The strategy on the other side is more implicitly predatory. The supplicants express concern about Volpone's well-being while asking about the number of heirs. This combination of explicit and implicit predation documents a highly opportunistic society. Unlike many other plays which involve rampant predation, Jonson offers a moralistic ending which makes it clear that he is withholding endorsement of such endemic social predation.

Comic playwrights divided their use of the hunt into two major categories — rural and urban — and then further subdivided each into actual, erotic and social predation. This description may seem complex but it allowed them to exploit many of the possibilities of the motif. In the actual rural and urban hunt, they described the sport of the powerful and the livelihood of the powerless. The erotic equivalent in these settings showed a similar dichotomy: the aristocrats practiced their flirtation skills while the disadvantaged pursued monetary gain through sexual service. The social hunt in comedies showed less of a range. The sharp tongue of these playwrights pointed to predation in many aspects of society.

3.2. Tragedies

Tragic playwrights rarely used the actual hunt as a suitable amusement for their aristocratic characters. Instead, they saw it as a means of illustrating strained social relationships. The representation of the hunt by tragic playwrights was far from decorative. Its inclusion contributes to the tragic situation by focusing on the isolation of the protagonist from others.[12] The erotic and social hunts were also significantly different from the comedies. In this erotic hunt, the focus was on disreputable suitors and urban sex workers. In the first chapter, I argued that there was a degree of social mobility in early modern English society. This is true but it does not negate the fact that the society functioned largely within a "hierarchy of power and traditional network of obligations" (Arthur Kinney Introduction to *The Spanish Tragedy* 49). It was these customs of domination and subservience between social strata which kept it together. These playwrights challenged the view of society as a cohesive structure by describing dramatic change with either a single downward spiral of a mighty individual or the more complex double or chiastic structure of a competing rise of a usurper. This depiction of social upheaval is important because playwrights use predatory references to describe it. The aggressor justifies his activity by enhancing himself and demeaning his victim through explicit but subtle metaphors drawn from

the actual hunt.

3.2.1 The Actual hunt

Playwrights of tragedies did not use the hunt for its amusement value. Instead, they saw it as a way of establishing social dynamics. In *Titus Andronicus,* Shakespeare illustrates the violent antipathy between the different court factions through diverse reactions to a proposed hunt. In the first act, Titus suggests the court embark on a hunt for "the panther and the hart" (1.1.493). By 2.1, it is evident that more than wild animals will be prey. Demetrius's comment that his aim is "to pluck a dainty doe to ground" (2.2.26) takes on a decidedly sinister tone because Lavinia's rape and disfigurement are already in his mind. In *Macbeth,* Shakespeare's hunt references serve at least two functions. The first is to convey unusual conditions in the environment. Thus, when an old man states he has seen a "mousing owl" (2.4.13) kill a falcon, it serves as an apt way to describe disorder through the reversal of the predatory hierarchy. The second function is to depict Macbeth as an unflappable hunter when he confronts Banquo's ghost. He challenges it to assume any one of three fierce prey — "rugged Russian bear, / The arm'd rhinoceros, or th' Hyrcan tiger" (3.4.99-100) — and he will remain unperturbed. What he cannot abide is confrontation with this "horrible shadow" (3.4.105). In *Dido,* Christopher

Marlowe uses the hunt to provide a concise character sketch of Aeneas. Early in the play, Aeneas suggests his son build a fire "to dress the meat we kill'd ... [so we can] roast our new-found victuals on this shore" (1.1.165-9). This reference indirectly tells the audience about Aeneas and his relationships with his men and his son. Aeneas is a practical man who sees his immediate task as organizing a meal. The fact that his expedition is successful points to a high degree of hunt-related expertise. Not only does the group find likely places for game but it also knows enough about the manoeuvres of these animals to thwart their escape. Aeneas's remarks to his son show that he does not treat him differently than any other member of his group. In other words, he expects his son to participate in what needs to be done and not to occupy a superior but non-functional role. In *A Woman Killed with Kindness,* Heywood uses two hunters (Francis Acton and Charles Mountford) to point out the absurdity of rivalry between two sportsmen. The argument between two aristocrats is about who has the better hawks and dogs, and it escalates into two deaths and the arrest of one of the hunters. In this example, each participant sees his fellow hunter as a prey. Heywood is not content with one set of predation references. He provides symmetry with a contrasting relationship of two non-aristocrats: Frankford and Wendoll. Unlike the relationship between Mountford and Acton which is competitive and public, this one is companionable and private. Instead of posturing for supremacy, Frankford and Wendoll disappear quietly together for periods. Heywood's

use of this aspect of the hunt is creative for he comments indirectly on two extremes of male interaction. The second hunting pair is meant to balance the first but also to accentuate a homoerotic closeness between Frankford and Wendoll. The relationship reveals a tranquil bond between two men through their joint interest in hunting. This depiction differs considerably from the way heterosexual erotic relationships are depicted in tragedies.

3.2.2 The Erotic Hunt

Tragedians discussed strained erotic relationships through predation metaphors. Unlike the male and female relationships in the comedies, the erotic hunt in tragedies was sinister with a lustful predator and a helpless "beloved." In Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus,* Lavinia's violation and mutilation are amongst the most extreme examples of erotic predation. While the court is distracted by the hunt, her assailants talk not so obliquely about their desire "to pluck a dainty doe to ground" (2.2.26). Lavinia's designation by her assailants as a doe is also shared by her family. Marcus describes her as "straying in the park, / Seeking to hide herself, as doth the deer" (3.1.88-9) and Titus plays with the dual meaning by calling her a wounded "dear" (3.1.91). Shakespeare continues to link Lavinia with the hunt when the family pursues a quest for the perpetrators. Lavinia's ingenious provision of the information they seek

spawns a revenge hunt for the "bear-whelps" (4.1.96), Chiron and Demetrius. An equally sad outcome of the erotic chase occurs at the end of *Dido* when the previously domineering queen calls Aeneas a "serpent" who creeps into her favour and then destroys her with his "venomed sting" (5.1.165-7). Her despairing victimhood is obvious and it is not a surprise that soon after the desertion she commits suicide.

It was far more common for tragic playwrights to describe two erotic hunts. In *Tamburlaine One* and *Two,* Marlowe uses both Tamburlaine's pursuit of Zenocrate, and Theridamas's focus on Olympia. The first chase is complicated by the fact that she is a princess and thus Tamburlaine attempts to "capture" a high status possession. A more disturbing aspect of this pursuit is that she is his captive and thus unable to offer resistance. The second pursuit is similar because Olympia is the victim of Theridamas's desire. She cleverly tricks him into stabbing her and thus permanently resists his attention. Despite her grisly end, Olympia is victorious in her adamant (and successful) refusal to succumb to his advances. This character's orchestrated violence is an evasion of erotic domination but successes by the victim are rare. The alignment of a woman with prey is also clear in *The Woman Killed with Kindness* with Acton's pursuit of Susan, and Wendell's interest in Anne. The first predator, Acton, is relentless. Her brother (Mountford) is his prisoner and he makes it clear that her compliance may win him leniency. By the tenth

scene, he (through an intermediary) offers her gold to increase her regard for him and she puts her refusal in hunting terms. She states that even "doves from feathered eagles fly" (9.57) and thus portrays herself as a peace-loving prey against a (socially) superior aggressor. Her resistance dwindles when her brother's release creates his alliance with the aggressor. Susan's marriage to her persistent suitor is a conventional ending to the erotic chase but the domination and manipulation used to describe it make it a less than joyful outcome. Another example of the erotic chase in this play is Wendoll's pursuit of Anne. Two of her servants, Sisly and Jenkins, use a sequence of proverbs about predation to reflect their anxiety about their mistress. Sisly sees the current episode as an example of "while-the-cat's away ..." to which Jenkins replies that he "smells a rat" (12.6-8). The untimely return of Anne's husband (again another instance of predation since it is premeditated) reveals the liaison. Despite Frankford's short lived rampage against Wendoll, the real victim is Anne. She feels acutely her sudden demotion to the position of a banished dog (13.88). Unlike the Susan and Acton subplot which ends in marriage, there is no such positive outcome for Anne. She dwindles steadily and dies in the remaining moments of the drama.

Webster's erotic hunt in *The White Devil* also uses two characters — Flamineo and Francisco — to comment on Brachiano's pursuit of Vittoria. From the early part of the play, Flamineo's role as panderer for

Brachiano is evident. He does, however, offer advice to the soon-to-be cuckolded husband of Vittoria. Using hunting references, he advises him to keep her "like a hound / In leon [leash] at [his] heels" (1.2.80-1) and out of the Duke's sight. Despite this remark, Flamineo views the erotic hunt as a form of imprisonment. He describes it as a "summer bird-cage in a garden: the birds that are without, despair to get in, and the birds that are within despair and are in a consumption for fear they shall never get out" (1.2.44-7). While Flamineo is a facilitator, Francisco is a more oppositional figure. His early analysis of Brachiano's situation is to refer to his envy towards the husband's "dove-house" and his own desire to set fire to it in order to "destroy [the] pole-cats that haunt" (2.1.2-4) it. Francisco continues his hunting analogy when he talks directly to Brachiano. He feels Brachiano is a superior "eagle" whose gaze should be considerably higher than a "dunghill" (2.1.49) or an inferior bird such as Vittoria. When his argument that she is beneath him fails to halt Brachiano's interest, Francisco underscores the possibility of contamination. In pointed comments that link "wild ducks" in "moulting time" (2.1.89-90), Francisco makes it clear that he sees Vittoria's soiled reputation as venereal disease. Somewhat surprisingly, Brachiano also treats Vittoria as a bird. He portrays her as a still untamed hawk when he refers to the "bells and [letting her] fly to the devil" (4.2.80-1). This analogy implies that she is either a superior figure and/or a predatory one and thus that he is

passively at her mercy. The anonymous playwright of *Arden of Faversham* also offers examples of implicit and explicit predation in two linked erotic hunts: Michael (a servant) and Clarke (a painter) pursue Susan, and Mosby chases Alice.[13] The competition for Susan seems conventional until her position as both Mosby's sister and Alice's serving maid is considered. Both her brother and her employer use her as "bait" to enhance the success of their murderous plot against Arden. The most closely examined and predation-rich relationship in the play, however, is between Mosby and Alice. Alice sees him as "sighted as the eagle" who preys upon the "fearful hare" (8.126-7) while Mosby paints himself as a poetic victim of a woman who changes from a peaceful dove to a sinister raven (8.97).[14]

The erotic hunt in this form of drama was unrelentingly bleak. It resembled most closely the torment seen in the poetry discussed in the second chapter but there were differences. Unlike the persona who lamented his anguish at the hands of a cruel and silent beloved, the tragic writers were more egalitarian. In their erotic hunts both of the participants were dissatisfied. Like their comic erotic equivalents, the lover and beloved acknowledged the predation component in their relationship. In the tragedies, they did not rejoice at the possibility of a shared reality with another person. Instead, they lamented that they are enmeshed in such an unsatisfactory situation. This dismal view of human interaction did not stop at the erotic. It continued to be a major component in a wider

spectrum of social relationships.

3.2.3 The Social Hunt

Since tragic playwrights wrote about the rise and fall of their main characters, they made ample use of predation to sketch the focused interest of the aggressor and the "paranoia" of the victim. This type of hunt occurs in Marlowe's *The Massacre at Paris*. The tyrannous behaviour of the Duke of Guise towards Protestants — and the attempts of others to thwart his actions — form the doubly predatory plot. In the first scene of the first act, the Duke of Navarre speaks of the Guise's "envious heart" which wishes to "murder all the Protestants" (29-30). Later in the same scene he describes how this same character "beats his brains to catch us in his trap, / Which he hath pitch'd within his deadly toil" (52-3). The Queen Mother also uses a hunting allusion when the Lord High Admiral is wounded by a soldier. As a supporter of her son's plan to exterminate Protestants, she feels this assault puts "the fatal, straggling deer / Within the compass of a deadly toil" (4.2-3) or massacre. This analogy serves to foreshadow future events when Guise and his supporters chase heretical Huguenot "prey" throughout the city. Predation is also never far from *Arden of Faversham* for, at its most basic, its focus is murder.[15] The inept hired killer, Shakebag, tries to prove his prowess for the task by comparing

himself to a starving lioness who is intent on her prey (3.111-5). As well Michael alludes to Arden's role as a lamb which is about to become the prey of a "hunter-bitten wolf" (3.198). In Jonson's *Sejanus*, the playwright relies on predator metaphors to make Sejanus's dual perspective clear. In the second act, this character talks to Tiberius and calls the emperor's forces "snakes" for they "lye / Rould in their circles, close" (2.2.256-7) and later "wolves" who "change their haire, but not their hearts" (2.2.273). In further conversation with them, Sejanus describes them as "so good vultures" (3.2.496) who will see their plans come to fruition. In *The White Devil*, Webster discusses predatory revenge strategy. When Monticelso encourages Francisco to consider retaliation for Isabella's murder, he cleverly advises cautious forbearance before any action. He suggests Francisco act as a lion and "let this brood of secure foolish mice / Play with your nostrils, till the time be ripe / For th' bloody audit and the fatal gripe" (4.1.16-9). He extends his analogy to include "a cunning fowler" (4.1.20-1) or bird hunter who closes one eye to see the game better.

If predation was used by aggressors to make their cause more vivid, it also defined the victim. One of the highlights of *Arden of Faversham* is when Arden dreams that he is the victim in a deer hunt (4.90-6). When he awakens, he speaks of having just escaped a close encounter with a lion. Despite his lack of awareness about the number of active human predators

around him, it is not too far-fetched to state that at least on the level of dream he has prey anxiety. A similar persecution occurs in *The White Devil* when a wounded, feverish and probably delusional Brachiano feels himself surrounded by a "raven" (5.3.90) who brings the darkness or death closer to him. He discusses the poison his "quails" (5.3.94) or courtesans consume, sees at least one politician as a "dog-fox" (5.3.95) and remarks (indirectly) that those around him are out to attack him. Lady Macduff and her son in *Macbeth* are also examples of victims who see themselves in predatory terms. They describe themselves as birds living in a natural setting but they also acknowledge the possibility of traps (4.2.32-7). Despite what seems to be their joint sense of imminent danger, neither of them sees clearly that Macbeth's predatory instincts will soon lead to their deaths. Another set of victim-related predatory examples occur in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*. Caesar himself takes note of Cassius's predatory qualities when he comments that he "has a lean and hungry look" (1.2.194). The assassins feel that their pursuit of Caesar is justifiable but Mark Anthony sees it as predation. In private, he calls Caesar a "brave hart" which has been "bay'd" (3.1.204) or cornered by his killers. His refiguring of Caesar's assassination into a deer hunt offers insight into his analysis of the event. The combination of being outnumbered and being unable to escape makes it clear that Mark Anthony sees these "hunters" as cowardly. Their actions are less than honourable because Caesar probably

would not have died in individual combat. What makes this analysis important is Mark Anthony's speech to the plebeians in the next scene. Neither he nor Caesar shares the hunting analogy with them but the sheer vigour of his devious rhetoric makes it clear that he feels a grave injustice has been carried out. In particular, t is Mark Anthony's private deer hunt analogy which serves a crucial indirect role in turning the crowd against the assassins.

One of the most prominent and complex uses of predatory metaphors is in Marlowe's two-part work, *Tamburlaine.* In *Tamburlaine One,* Mycetes speaks of Tamburlaine as a "fox in the midst of harvest time / Doth play upon my flocks of passengers" (1.1.31-2). The sense of unlawful plunder is further underlined by Tamburlaine's association with thievery. One of the early references is by Meander who calls him "that sturdy Sythian thief / That robs" (*One* 1.1.36-7). The viewpoint is that of those in power for they portray Tamburlaine as a greedy outsider who pursues what is not his. The epithets thrust at Tamburlaine by his opponents are meant to demonize him in order to exaggerate what they consider his illegitimate aspirations. On the other hand, one of Tamburlaine's followers portrays their endeavour as that of "princely lions ... [s]tretching their paws and threat'ning herds of beasts" *(One* 1.2.52-3). The difference between the fox and "princely lions" is not insignificant since it signals a fundamental difference in outlook. To the elite, the fox is a threat to harmony. To the predator, the lion is a leader

who uses force to acquire his legitimate position. Marlowe continues to use these two definitions of predation — the illegitimate outsider and the self legitimizing overreacher — to provide internal cohesion to the plays.[15] This combination of illegitimate and legitimate predation is evident in an exchange between Bajazeth and Tamburlaine in *One* (3.3.134-163). In speeches filled with explicit military bombast, Bajazeth and Tamburlaine profess the superiority of their respective troops. This is a rare case. Most often Tamburlaine is equated (by the elite) as prey. In 4.3, the Soldan imagines a series of hunting situations between his troops and Tamburlaine. He sees them as giving "chase [to a] ... savage Calydonian boar" (3) and portrays himself as "Cephalus [a hunter who destroyed a wild beast in Ovid's *Metamorphosis*] with lusty Theban youths / Against the wolf" (4-5). In the same speech, the Soldan returns to earlier epithets and joins them with venery. He calls Tamburlaine a "sturdy felon and a base-bred thief ... [who] dares control us in our territories" 12-4) and forcefully suggests that the armies unite to "tame the pride of this presumptuous beast" (15). In response, one of his countrymen (Capolin) gleefully envisions this army's descent on Tamburlaine as a "frolic ... [by] the hunters in the chase / Of savage beasts amid the desert woods" (4.3.56-7). Toward the end of the play, the "beasts" turn on their predators. In 4.4, Tamburlaine and his cohorts torment the caged Bajazeth by alluding to his status as an edible prey. Exultant in his power over the

prisoner, Tamburlaine suggests that Bajazeth eat his own flesh (4.4.37, 43-4) to sustain himself and later that his wife (Bajazeth) be used in a similar manner (4.4.48-51). His suggestions are rejected but such comments show the extent to which Tamburlaine sees himself as predator/torturer and no longer the persecuted underdog. Perhaps the most graphically violent passage is the frenzied cruelty against Tamburlaine by Bajazeth and Zabina. It is this impotent couple that fantasizes about an immobilized captive who is repeatedly mutilated by waves of arrows, firebrands, pikes, bullets, cannon, swords, and lances (5.2.151-66).

In *Tamburlaine Two*, forces begin to move against Tamburlaine and he is again an object of predation.[16] In 2.3, Orcanes portrays Tamburlaine as a "barbarous body [which will soon] be a prey / To beasts and fowls" (14-5). When he is finally captured, the messenger who delivers the news to the victors describes his capture as "hounds / With open cry pursu[ing] the wounded stag" (3.5.6-7). In the subsequent scene, an unrepentant Tamburlaine simultaneously reverses and escalates his position by vehemently declaring the degradation he will apply to his captors when he is free (3.5.117-127). Instead of wounding his enemies, his thoughts focus on concussion, disembowelment, branding, scalding, and dismemberment. Tamburlaine continues to unleash his verbal fury upon his captors in 4.1 when he openly sees them as barking dogs which he will silence with "bits of burnished steel" (181). In *Two*, predation also

outlines family dynamics. Wounding his own body (3.2.114), Tamburlaine exhorts his sons to withstand pain and become soldiers. In this self-mutilating episode, he is simultaneously a predatory perpetrator and a prey. Tamburlaine's embracing of predation to keep control of his offspring takes on a new dimension when he stabs his less than militarily inclined son, Calyphas, in 4.1. In a parallel scene, the wife of the Captain of Balsera (Olympia) stabs her son rather than see him tortured and killed by Tamburlaine's army. Olympia's act is simultaneously predatory and anti-predatory. She targets her son for execution but she does so to keep him from being a focus of interest by an even crueler predator.

Playwrights of comedies and tragedies wanted to set out a world which their audience found accessible. One of the ways they achieved this accessibility was by incorporating predation into their plots. Expanding predation to include the actual, erotic and social hunts, the playwrights incorporated an activity, an erotic chase and a predatory view of society into their works. In the comedies, the actual hunt conveyed social status of the characters to the viewer. In its rural form, it was an aristocratic sport. In its urban form, it was a criminal activity against human prey. The erotic hunt in comedies had two speakers who mutually explored its predatory aspects. The social hunt criticized both those who are overly focused on the hunt and society at large. Tragic playwrights treated the three types of

hunt differently. The actual hunt served less of a scene-setting function than in the comedies. What was important was that predation revealed underlying tensions. The erotic hunt was most closely aligned with the poetic hunt because it dealt with power inequities. But it was simultaneously unlike the poetic hunt because the female figure was helpless against the male pursuer. Since the antisocial tendencies associated with usurpation lay at the heart of tragedies, playwrights often used predatory references to underscore social criticism. The persistent and varied use of predation in these plays revealed that the playwright and the audience exhibited a thorough knowledge of hunt culture, and that there was an underlying and ongoing desire for the depiction of domination. The playwrights showed the tensions in all human relations and used predation much like the poets to deal with female aggression to make the point vivid. The goal of most interpersonal domination was to create underlings and keep them in their place. Such dynamics, however, simultaneously opened up the possibility that these arrangements could be overturned. The underlings might rebel and change the status quo. Just as describing female aggression helped poets and their readers deal with their fears, predation in plays performed much the same function. The use of the dominance and subservience of predation allowed the ruler to "see" the results of political severity. It also gave potential usurpers a chance to dream about the possibility of power.

The objective of this chapter was to analyze the use playwrights made of the hunt in comedies and tragedies. The next chapter moves to another movement in the interpretation of hunting. The following discussion will focus mainly on the importance of the sport in prose fiction.

4. Hunting Prose

My analysis in the previous chapter was of drama and predation. The hunt in the comedies was a way of illustrating the erotic chase and critiquing social behaviour. In the tragedies, aggression was often framed in predatory terms. The hunting applications in drama were made more complex with variations in setting. In rural scenes, the hunt was a suitable background for aristocratic characters. In urban scenes, predation described criminal activity against human prey. This chapter will extend analysis into the little explored area of early modern literature: prose fiction.

With the possible exceptions of Philip Sidney's *The Old Arcadia,* George Gascoigne's "The Discourse of the Adventures passed by Master F. J." and Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller,* the plays (and to a lesser extent the poetry) of the period garner most of the critical attention.[1] The lack of interest in prose fiction has not deterred several critics from categorizing the variety. Robert Morss Lovett and Helen Sard Hughes divide the prose works of the period into three classes: the idealistic romance, the embryonic novel of manners, and the picaresque novel (15). Charles Mish offers a complex system of categories and sub-categories based on oppositional approaches: the romantic and the realistic

(Introduction vii). Since my interest is not in the genre's eventual evolution into the novel but rather its use of a particular theme, I will break the works in this chapter into two groups: the romantic quest, and the picaresque pursuit. The prose romance narrative used simplified characters, adventure and an often idealistic quest (Abrams 120). Picaresque pursuit was "realistic in manner, episodic in structure ... and usually satiric in aim" (Abrams 119). Both these categories used the actual, erotic and social hunts but they differ substantially. Following from erotic poetry with its mythological references and the rural comedies, the romantic quest utilized the actual hunt undertaken by aristocrats and made it a major part of its plot. These writers much like those who wrote comedies intertwined the actual and the erotic hunts. On the other hand, picaresque pursuit narratives dealt with the other end of the social spectrum. Drawing from the urban comedies and the tragedies, they focused on the human-hunting-human activities of rogues and vagabonds in London. They were closely aligned with urban comedies because the locales were identical but also drew from tragedies because they dealt with manipulative relationships. In this type of fiction, all three types of hunts were about financial gain at someone else's expense. In the language of the times, a picaresque hunt was a "coney-catching." *The Oxford English Dictionary* defines a coney as simultaneously a rabbit, a (decent and indecent) term for a woman, and a dupe. This kind of "catching" used

three forms of predation — the rural, the erotic, and the social — to create a multi-layered approach. The remainder of this chapter begins with a three-pronged approach to the romantic quest and ends with a similar discussion of the picaresque pursuit fiction.

4.1. Romantic Quests

Adventures, aristocrats and love were inseparable in the romantic quest and at least part of the excitement of this subgenre was the hunt.[2] Undertaken as a healthy diversion, the sport ostensibly focused on a kill but more often the goal was of secondary significance. What was more important for many writers was that the sport offered them an opportunity to discuss their characters. Using the actual, erotic and social hunts, they drew on their readers' knowledge of the actual sport to analyze characters, social roles and courtship rituals.

4.1.1 The Actual Hunt

Prose fiction writers employed hunting as a scene setting device but more importantly these situations also provided individual character sketches and gender expectations. Both George Gascoigne and Philip Sidney used it in this way. In Gascoigne's "A Discourse of the Adventures

Passed by Master F. J," Elinor's cuckolded husband and her lover, F. J. , embark on a hunting expedition. On the surface, the portrayal of their hunt is mundane: the husband forgets his hunting horn and cannot blow a note from the one F. J. offers him. With cuckoldry and horns being closely linked, the early modern reader would interpret these details as signs of sexual dysfunction. What is unexpected is the presence of G. T. as narrator and his desire to make these links explicit.[3] Much of G. T.'s interpretation of the scene lies in his ability to assess accurately what F. J. "sayde to him selfe" (180) and indeed F. J. feels he understands the significance of the hunting horn incident. Even before the "fal of the Buck" (180), F. J. composes a sonnet — "As some men say there is a kind of seed" (180) — to give to Elinor. F. J.'s "bawdy" (Ericksen 200) creation simultaneously mocks the husband and brags about his conquest. The incident ends with G. T.'s embarrassment over this example of a young man's exultation.

Sidney utilizes two hunting situations to define character and social roles in the first book of *The Old Arcadia*. He uses predation as a form of shorthand when Basilius strays "out of his way one time a-hunting" (28) and meets Dametas. In a misapprehension about his status and occupation (Dametas is a shepherd), the King inquires about his kennel and is rudely rebuffed. This incident triggers questions about the king's social acuity. These doubts are reinforced when he invites Dametas to court as an advisor. The narrator comments that the duke is committing a "great error" (28) but, using a string of hunt-related analogies, Basilius makes it

clear that he is not about to refashion the shepherd any "more than ... [he would teach] a horse to hunt, or a hound to bear a saddle" (28). What he wants from him is his unsophisticated advice. Sidney also uses a double hunt of a lion and a bear at the end of the book to reveal the characters of his two courting couples: Philoclea and Pyrocles/Cleophila, and Pamela and Musidorus/Dorus.[4] The episode involves killing predators and rescuing female prey and thus allows the author to define these characters along widely accepted gender lines. The episode crosses the line between the actual and the erotic and thus will be discussed further in the following section.

Sidney and Gascoigne thought of predation as an activity and as a way to define contemporary male expectations. Mary Wroth had a different approach in *Urania*. Much of the second book of her work deals with female hunters with an emphasis on Pamphilia's need to pursue an outdoor life to alleviate her depression. Hunting remains largely undescribed but it does allow her to shift her focus outside herself. For this character, the hunt often follows a night of wrestling with her "thoughts to love" (216.12), or the onset of "melancholly" (266.39). In the fourth and final book, Wroth matches her innovative incorporation of female hunters with her interest in hunting couples. There are references to a King who "fel to sports, [and] the Queen [who] affected only prety delights, and none so violent as hunting" (514.17) as well as a "Queene [who] fished, while the

King hunted" (518.29). Pamphilia and Amphilanthus eventually declare their love and celebrate their relationship with a hunting expedition (569.16) where they fish, hawk and hunt (575.11-13). This hunting idyll ends when Amphilanthus suddenly disappears and it is not until almost the last page of the narrative that the lovers are reunited.

Sidney, Gascoigne and Wroth all used the actual hunt as an important activity for their characters. Although they differed in their emphasis on one gender or the other, they incorporated the actual hunt into their romantic tales to show an aspect of their characters' quest. The non-metaphoric application of the hunt was not the only form to be used. Many writers adopted predatory terms and situations to illustrate the erotic relationships.

4.1.2 The Erotic Hunt

Writing before the turn of the seventeenth century, several prose romance writers — George Pettie, Gascoigne, John Lyly, Robert Greene, and Thomas Lodge — adopted a few of the predatory "conventions" from love poetry and used mythological figures. In *A Petite Pallace,* Pettie evokes the figure of Cupid and his snares (56, 168) to accentuate entrapment. A poem in Gascoigne's "The Discourse of the Adventures Passed by Master F. J." makes it clear that F. J. feels himself perpetually

caught by Cupid (159-60). As well Lucilla in Lyly's *Euphues* cunningly denies her experience at the "court of Cupid" (126) to disguise her ability to deceive. In Greene's *Menaphon,* "the wylie shaft of Cupid" hits the young man (33) and even his friend, Samela, notices that "Cupide ... [has] caught the poor shepheard in his net" (39). During a witty interplay between Arsadachus and Margaritan in Lodge's *A Margarite of America,* Cupid makes an unusual appearance as a hooded falcon whose eyes are like arrows (168). Perhaps the most prolonged use of these figures is in Lodge's *Rosalind*. In the introductory passage, Sir John of Bordeaux with advice to his sons paints a bleak picture of love in general and women in particular. To him, Venus is a "wanton" who leads a man into "loss and glistering misery'" and Cupid's arrows "enforce nothing but deadly desires" (100). Each of these writers used mythological links to give their characters depth and a link to poetry but they were the exceptions.

Most romance narrators did not pursue this kind of layering in an attempt to establish the link but rather tied their characters to the rural and erotic hunts. Far from being an animal and human hunt narrative, the romance quest was equally important for its erotic aspects. Just as in the comedies, it was almost impossible to keep the actual and the erotic hunts separated. This interplay was explicit in the early hunt scene with the two courting couples mentioned in the previous section. At least part of the motivation of Pyrocles/Cleophila to destroy the lion comes from his

jealousy. He observes "how greedily the lion went after the prey she herself so much desired" and subsequently wonders "whether it is a competitor" (42-3). As Franco Marenco points out, the "competition" in which Pyrocles/Cleophila "finds himself engaged gives us a glimpse of the forces at work in his heart" (253). Overlapping agendas are no less clear in the parallel foray between Musidorus/Dorus and a predatory bear. Elegantly declaring himself willing to sacrifice his already captive heart in Pamela's defense, Musidorus/Dorus quickly dispatches the beast. Not only are both lovers successful against their adversaries but the episodes allow physical intimacy with the beloveds. Philoclea falls upon the breast of Pyrocles/Cleophila (42) and Musidorus/Dorus kisses the inert Pamela "a hundred times" (47). Although the intertwining of the actual and erotic hunt was usually a serious subject about power inequities, Sidney's descriptions of hungry beasts, fainting women and impertinent hunters has the lightness of a burlesque. Katherine Duncan-Jones points out that even the convenient allocation of "one beast per prince makes the encounter ... little more than an amusing opportunity for them to show off to the girls" (Introduction xiv). This author's intertwining of rural and erotic hunts was relatively lighthearted but Pettie's story of Cephalus and Procris in *A Petite Pallace* was its darker twin. Cephalus and Procris marry but their mutual jealousy motivates them to spy on each another. In a plot reminiscent of Chapman's *The Widow's Tears,* Cephalus returns home before his appointed time to test her fidelity. Procris, in turn, follows

him on a hunt to "see how sone this subtill Foxe could deceive" (207) her. Unfortunately, he mistakes her for prey and kills her.

In Wroth's *Urania,* the erotic pursuit often occurs during outdoor activity. Parselius is hunting when he meets a desirable young lady (519.28-9), and as well Pelarina first sees her love when "new come from hunting" (529.16). The Pelarina example is a dual hunting episode. A few pages later, she states that she and her inconstant lover "Hunt ... together, and Hawke with such pleasure as drew envy on us both" (531.8-9). In *Menaphon* and *Pandosto,* Greene's interest is in the predator who unrelentingly pursues his lustful inclinations. In the first work, a series of predators creates the action: shepherds (including Menaphon) pursue Samela, the pirate Euilachus hunts and captures Pleusidippus and, finally, Democles chases and kidnaps Samela (a daughter he does not recognize). Despite the sequence of lustful predators, the tale ends "happily" with a re-united father and daughter as well as several marriages. *Pandosto* also uses the erotic chase but focuses on one individual and his jealousy and predation. The tale begins with Pandosto's jealousy. He imprisons and eventually executes his wife because he feels there has been too much familiarity between her and a guest. He searches for a new partner but the object of his interest (Fawnia) does not return his affections. As in *Menaphon,* Fawnia turns out to be Pandosto's daughter. Unlike the earlier tale, there is no happy ending, for Pandosto realizes his errors and

commits suicide.[5]

In the second book of *Urania,* Wroth focuses on Dolorindus and a female predator. As the non-aggressor in the burgeoning relationship, he emphasizes her competence and Diana-like qualities (182-83) during the hunt.[6] One aspect of the episode (which is repeated later in Pamphilia's soliloquy to the stag) is that the "inner thoughts" of the stag are interpreted by Dolorindus. From an anthropomorphic perspective, he finds that the animal takes "pride in being so pursued" (182.35) and is pleased that he "stoutly commanded her attendance" (182.36) on him. His linking of his longings with pursuit by his beloved is a clear intertwining of erotic and actual hunts. What is interesting about the tie is that Dolorindus feels triumphal control in being the desired object of this accomplished and beautiful predator. This was not always the case. In Lodge's *Rosalind,* the forester (Ganymede) appears to visitors to be forlorn about a disappointing actual hunt but his anguished love chase after Rosalind is the true cause (149) of his woe.

Not all predation resulted in a chase. At least one prose fiction writer discussed love as immobilization. In Greene's *Menaphon,* the main character is "snared" (43) by Samela's beauty while, in *Rosalind,* Rosalind's "hairs [are as if] ... love had laid herself in ambush to entrap the proudest eye that durst gaze upon their excellence" (109). Later, in the same work, Montanus speaks of love as fettering in its "snares of lust"

(128) or as a bird which is trapped (129). Another shepherd, Corydon, sees love as a "subtle net to snare the idle mind" and a "seeing scorpion" (129). In Reynolds's "Don Juan and Marsillia," the father's heart is "ensnared and entangled in the fetters" (199).

In more complex stories, writers fluctuated between opposite predation positions. In a tale of "erotic violence," (Mish Introduction to "Don Juan and Marsillia" 196) "Don Juan and Marsillia," Reynolds uses complex predation to shape his tale.[7] Marsillia is prey for her father-in-law (Idiaques) and her lusty brother (De Perez). The revelations by a servant about her mistress's close relationship with Idiaques transform Marsillia into a predator. She "hires" her brother to kill the servant. This murderous arrangement dramatically changes the previous family dynamic. Not only is Marsillia now a predator but De Perez's hunting interest also moves from the erotic to the murderous. Ironically, Marsillia returns to the status of prey, for she dies when her horse throws her to the ground after being startled by a hare (224). Reynolds was not the only writer to fluctuate between the two extremes of predator and prey. In *Euphues*, Lyly just as dramatically reverses predatory roles between his hero (Euphues) and Lucilla. Meeting the first time, Euphues describes himself alternatively as a predator who feeds on Lucilla's beauty (105), and as a prey who he sees her as "delicate bait with a deadly hook, a sweet panther with a devouring paunch, a sour poison in a silver pot" (107). The long-standing amorous

chase of Pyrocles/Cleophila by Basilius and Gynecia in the third book of *The Old Arcadia* also alternates between predator and prey. An example of these rapid shifts is in the interaction between Pyrocles/Cleophila and Gynecia in a cave. Seeking "to yield herself ... to the flood of her own thoughts" (157), Pyrocles/Cleophila enters and subsequently feels that with Gynecia's presence s/he treads on "a deadly stinging adder" (161). This self-designation solidifies her prey role with the pursuer. What makes the scene important is that Gynecia also sees herself as prey. She feels as if she is holding a wolf and will be bitten if she holds it or be slain if it gets loose (162). Another example of fluctuation in roles is in the ironically named *Pallace of Pleasure* by Pettie. It is a series of tales which includes hunters and hunted at every turn. To get a sense of the unrelenting nature of the theme, here are a few of the plots of the short stories: Sinorix desires Camma so much that he murders her husband, and she avenges his death; Geramnicus marries Agrippina but a cousin poisons him and Agrippina starves herself to death; and Horatia's heartbroken response to news that her husband has been killed by her brother causes him to kill the servant. Even this quick survey shows that few characters remain frozen in their hunter or hunted categories but rather move between the two, depending on circumstances. In the first story, Camma is the object of Sinorix's erotic yearnings but subsequently becomes a hunter herself when she kills her husband's murderer, and there are two other stories which illustrate much

the same fluctuation in status: "Minos and Pasiphae" and "Pigmalions friende, and his Image" are two tales which deal with the desires of characters to gain domination with unusual partners: Pasiphae chooses a passionately inclined bull and Pigmalion carves his wife from a slab of marble.

Prose fiction writers often included elements of hunt culture to describe the erotic in romantic quests. Using the predation of erotic poetry as a guide, they sought to dramatize the ongoing struggle for domination in male and female relationships. They relied on their readers' knowledge of hunt culture to bridge the gap between a well-known sport and literature. These writers also used predation to dramatize a greater range of often rancorous social relationships.

4.1.3 The Social Hunt

Hunters in prose fiction were not always erotically inclined. They more than occasionally focused their predatory interest on people other than a beloved. In *Rosalind* and *A Margarite of America,* Lodge makes an individual's hunt of other humans a major part of his plots. In the first work, it is Saladyne's continuing harassment of his brother (Rosader) which is at the centre of the tale. Early in the story, the narrator calls Saladyne deceptive because he is like a "tiger, though he hides his claws" and a lion whose peaceful looks do not display his true feelings (102).

Indeed, the character tries repeatedly to kill his brother and gain his inheritance. In the second work, the main character — Arsadachus — hunts humans and much of the plot revolves around his serial predation. This character's idea of recreational hunting is murdering those who displease him, and there are many who fit into the category. When a young woman rejects him, he simulates an animal hunt by stalking and murdering her (and her beloved) in a "dangerous" woods filled with "lions, beares, eagles, griffins, and al other birds and beasts whatsoever" (142). He subsequently kills two men: one who is the father of the murdered girl and another whom he decides wishes to assassinate his father-in-law, the King. His interest in yet another young woman ends in her execution along with their child. The murder which ends the tale is of his long suffering wife and it is only then that his debauchery is suspected and punished.

The hunt served a wide range of functions for early modern writers of the romantic quest. Since the word "quest" signified a focus on a goal or outcome, these writers used predation to enhance the idea when they provided an activity for aristocratic characters. Predation also served a critical function. Individual responses to hunt-related issues were used to reveal lapses in judgment. Writers of romantic quest prose fiction did not stand apart from others in their usage of predation. Just as other writers had done, they continued to see the value in linking imaginative works

with the sport. They did not have the final word on the subject. Writers of picaresque pursuit tales also made considerable but quite different use of predation.

4.2. Picaresque Pursuits

Picaresque pursuit writers did not offer their readers a world filled with aristocrats in rural settings.[8] Instead, they constructed stories about devious thieves working in an urban environment.[9] Much as actual predators sought to incapacitate an animal, these urban hunters wished to immobilize wealthy individuals and relieve them of as many of their belongings as possible. As well, they used strategies similar to the actual hunt such as sighting, stalking and running to ground in order to manoeuvre the prey into position for the heist or "kill." The connection between the rural and urban hunt was linked explicitly through the similarity of goal and design and implicitly through similar terminology but there were differences. As well analysis of the characters was lacking because there was often little depth to them. What did remain was the erotic chase but even this form of specialized hunting was different. The urban equivalent focused on a prostitute who pursued her prey for monetary reimbursement. Indeed, it was the focus on money or its equivalents which set the urban hunt and its erotic extension most

dramatically apart from its rural equivalent. This predation was in a money-based economy with a focus solely on the entrepreneurial hunter.[10] The narrators who wrote about this type of predation did so from the view of the winner — the hunter — and thus the prey was less important. This perspective highlighted a sharp contrast between poetic and picaresque erotic hunts. Instead of a focus on the beleaguered prey, picaresque tales dealt with the triumphant predator. The result of this difference was that these tales appeared boastful and thus were significantly less engaging. One possible conclusion is that picaresque pursuits were inferior literary works but that would be incorrect. What these single-strand narratives lost in complexity, they gained in intensity. They were about successful exploiters who tended to grow in the esteem of the readers. Rather than the highly conflicted hunters in other genres, these urban hunters pursued their prey with directness and ingenuity and the narratives glorified their successes. The result was paradoxical: the least complex hunting tales left the most vivid impression of predation on the reader.

4.2.1 The Actual Hunt

Some of the best examples of this lively view of the London underworld were in Greene's cony catching pamphlets with a narrator who assumed the role of observer of prey and predator.[11] In the introduction to

A Notable Discovery of Coosnage, Greene reveals his sense of personal danger, for he fears his writing hand may be cut off for divulging the practices of the hacksters of "that filthie facultie" (12) in print. This writer's sense of being within what he is writing about makes his writing immediate and compelling. But at least part of its appeal comes from the explicit connections between the rural and urban hunts. Drawing on the public's ample knowledge of rabbit hunting and using similar terminology, Greene's narrator makes his version graphic and tangible.[12] As early as the first pamphlet, Greene uses the word "prey" as a noun and a verb: the focus of cozening companions is on the "praie" (16) and these same individuals prey upon the ignorance of "such plain foules" (18). The activity between the predator and prey is also described as a chase (26). By the second pamphlet, Greene increases the luridness of his terminology. In his dedicatory epistle, he calls cony catchers "vultures" (70) and "Vipers" (72) and, later in the same text, the narrator describes a thief with the qualities of two exemplary animal predators: "Eagles eie to spie a purchase, to have a quicke insight where the boong lies, and then a Lyons heart not to feare what the end will bee" (107). He even likens the hook-in-window thievery to an angle or fishing rod (123). By the fourth pamphlet, *The Defense of Conny catching,* Greene assumes the persona of Cuthbert Cunny-catcher (title page) and uses animal predators even more.[13] His goal is to refute remarks made in "two injurious Pamphlets published by R[obert] G[reene]" (title page) about his profession. Cuthbert's aim is

straightfoward: Greene should focus on major predators rather than pick on cony catchers. The narrator often creates his simultaneous offensive and defensive strategy against Greene around oppositional animals. In his diatribe against Greene, he calls him a spider who sets out to

> intrap and snare little Flyes, but weaves it so slenderly, that the great ones breake through without any dammage. You straine Gnats, and pass over Elephants; you scoure the ponde of a fewe croaking Frogges, and leave behinde an infinite number of most venemous Scorpions (51)

He saves his most vitriolic analogies for usurers whom he calls "Fox-furd Gentlemen that hyde under their gownes ... more falshood then all the Conny-catchers in *England*" (52).

Greene was not the only prose writer with an interest in urban predation. After Greene's death, Dekker continued the tradition with his *The Belman of London*. Their approaches differed: Greene made a metaphoric connection between the rural and the urban hunt while Dekker underlined the tie in an even more explicit fashion. In his introduction to Dekker's works, E. D. Pendry states that the author organizes his work around the proposition that the "low life of the countryside is no closer to the pastoral ideal than the low life of the city" (20). Dekker himself makes

an even stronger case when he states that "[b]etter it is in the solitarie woods, and in the wilde fields to be a man amongst Beastes than in the midest of a peopled Citie, to bee a Beast among men" (73). Dekker also provides predatory links in the names he chooses for different types of criminals: a Russler swears he has lost limbs in war and makes a living begging or robbing country people (94), an Angler fishes for goods by thrusting a rod with a hook on the end into windows (94-5), and a Quire-Byrd builds his own nest by filching goods from under a man's roof (100-1). Predation is also evident in his discussion of thievery laws: in the Prigging Law, lock pickers are like "Battes or Owles away they fly over hedge and ditch out of those quarters" (142); in the Lifting Law (145-50), a thief sinks his "Vultures tallants, [into his prey's luggage] and away flies he presently to his nest, to feede and sat his ravenous gorge with the garbage which he hath gotten" (149); and in the Figging Law (154-61) pickpockets look with "hawkes eyes" (157).[14]

Picaresque pursuit writers saw clear parallels between their world and the actual hunt. As a result, they used language which made the connection clear. In the rough and tumble of their portrayal, they shared no illusions that anything existed beyond the bloodthirsty treacherousness they saw around them. Their interest in peeling back any pretense of civility to reveal pecuniary motivations continued when relationships between men and women were considered.

4.2.2 The Erotic Hunt

In picaresque pursuit narratives, the erotic was not about long-term intimacy but most often short-term genital contact. This form of engagement was the female equivalent of urban predation. These forthright women most often saw their male prey as money which should easily be put into their own pockets. In *The Disputation Betweene a Hee Conny-catcher, and a Shee Conny-catcher,* Greene creates just such a woman — Nan — who sees herself as a hunter who uses "lime twigs" (204) and "nettes" (212) to trap her prey. The debate which runs throughout the pamphlet is whether a male or female trickster is the greatest threat to the citizenry. Nan's stories of her exploits easily win. She is not the only woman who profits from her sexuality.[15] Enterprising women also appear in other tales. In *The Tinker of Turvey*'s "The Cobblers Tale," the smith's wife accepts gifts in return for sexual service, while in "The Gentlemans Tale," Marian uses her allure to torment Rowland and marry someone else. One of the most curious erotic hunts occurs between the widow and Jack in Thomas Deloney's *Jack of Newbury*. Even though she makes her interest in him explicit and invites him into her bed, he hesitates because he feels she is ungovernable. Only after she tricks him into the marriage ceremony are they able to establish a more moderate position towards

each other.

Not all forthright women pursued predation alone but worked with others. Nan is a good example of such co-operation for she, with her thieving husband, strip a client of everything right down to his skin. Nan's story involves a man who hides his money inside his doublet and thus thwarts cutpurses. Her bawdy skills are invaluable for the successful completion of the theft. Referring to her prey as a "Foxe," he leaves his "skinne, for this is his doublet and hoase" (219) beside the bed, just as men (including her husband) enter to search for evil doers. Nan shuts the terrified client into a closet and the theft is complete. This sequence was not an original design; crossbiting was one of the many multi-character strategies outlined in urban predation narratives.[17] What makes it interesting is that it is different from Wroth's hunting couples. Far from having a quiet time together, the couple (Nan and her husband) view the hunt as a paying job. Stories about hardworking women and enterprising schemes also abound in *The Tinker of Turvey*. In "The Smiths Tale," the smith and the cobbler's wife are clever lovers who trick her husband into thinking them virtuous. Another narrative which made ample use of sexual predation was Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*. Whereas implicit eroticism occurs at the beginning of the book, more explicit episodes crowd its final pages, with Juliana Diamante and Wilton either individually or together trying to prey upon their predators.

Picaresque pursuit writers provided a view of their world which was mercenary and predatory. Drawing on terminology from hunt culture, they applied these terms to aspects of their world. Even the most intimate relationships used the bald language of predation to convey its exploitation. The portrayal of a world to the reader in this specific way continued in the portrayal of a broader range of social relationships.

4.2.3 The Social Hunt

The realistic tales which Greene and Dekker created were not the only approaches to urban predation. One of the most compelling is Nicholas Breton's biography, *The Miseries of Mavillia.* Dividing her life's story into six parts, Mavillia relates a tale of unrelenting victimhood as an orphan, a mistreated servant, a falsely accused thief and, finally, a much pursued heiress. Mavillia sees herself as a prey only once when she refers to being "dogge" (43) but implicit predatory references abound in the text. Predators continue to persecute Mavillia even when she is married and pregnant. A crazed suitor threatens to kill her husband and only relents when she agrees to have her nose bitten off. The tale ends with her bandaging her husband's wounds and awaiting her child's birth. Breton's story of the beleaguered Mavillia was not the only tale about ongoing social predation. The male equivalent is *The Unfortunate Traveller* in which John Wilton portrays his nomadic life as he follows the "Court or the

camp, or the camp and the Court" (254) in a sequence of implicitly predatory episodes with men.[19] His early description of himself as "King of the Cans and Black-jacks, Prince of the Pigmies, County Palatine of Clean Straw and Provant, and ... Lord High Regent of Rashers of the Coals and Red-herring Cobs" (254) makes it clear that he is favoured among his contemporaries. What makes his situation predatory is his description that he is also the "prince of their purses ... [who exacts] of [his] unthrift subjects as much liquid allegiance as any keisar in the world could do" (255) because he gains financially through their adoration. What he does not explain is what he must do to gain the financial reward but it is clear that it is a predatory situation. This type of intense liaison with individual men continues in Wilton's relationship with his Cidership (256), Monsieur Capitano (263) and Lord Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey (286). By the time he reaches Rome, his days of manipulative predation are over and he becomes a victim. He spends time in jail at the hands of the sadistic Esras of Granado and later he is sold as a specimen for an anatomy class. Not all predatory tales take place in exotic locales. Indeed, the six separate tales in *The Tinker of Turvey* are related during an English barge trip (in much the same manner as Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*) and they contain at least one urban predatory situation. In "The Tinkers Song," three cheating "sharks" set out to separate the tinker from his horse. When they succeed, he, in turn, tricks them into buying a "magical" goat. The sense of

predatory trickery is also seen in *The Pleasant History of Cawwood the Rooke* in which two anthropomorphic birds — Rapax the Hawk and Cawwood the Rook — jostle for power. Although a predator of other birds, Rapax convinces the Bird Parliament that rooks are their enemy. They then vote him their King, and Cawwood out of the Commonwealth. This animal fable is an unusual addition to picaresque pursuit narratives because it deals ostensibly with animals and is set outside an urban setting. The tale is a thinly disguised examination of the predatory aspects of collective human interaction.

In the picaresque quest, however, the hunt served a narrow range of functions for early modern writers. Unlike the romantic quest writers, they did not use it as a realistic activity for their aristocrats, but instead found it useful as a form of shorthand characterization. These writers knew that the reader had an extensive knowledge of hunt culture and so they used its metaphoric use within an urban context. The crafty working poor were hunters because they pursued anyone with money or property. In this type of prose fiction, the differences between the form of hunt and its erotic version were minimal. Both of them involved stripping as much property and money from the human prey as possible.

Prose fiction shared many of the same predation approaches found

in other genres. The actual hunt again was an activity for the top and the bottom of society. In the romantic quest, writers concentrated on their often upper-class characters. They used it as a status-appropriate activity but also as a way to critique aspects of their characters' personalities. In picaresque tales, the actual hunt was slightly different. It offered more widespread criticism because it underlined the predatory habits of the urban poor. The erotic hunt followed much the same sociological division, with the romances focusing on ardent aristocrats and the picaresque tales depicting more sexual and money-driven dynamics of the urban poor. What set prose fiction apart from the plays was a more prominent social critique. Criticism (either individual or universal) was not entirely missing from the plays but it was far more prominent in the prose fiction. These writers used a critical eye in the actual and the social hunt. Their linking of two hunts with critical intent made the genre's writers amongst the most interesting users of predation. They understood the powerful impact a link with hunting culture could make on the reader. Just as the erotic poets used the hunt to signal threats to patriarchy, prose fiction writers did much the same thing but with a different focus. They wished to point to social rifts. In a society which valued stability, the vicarious acting out of alternative ways of dealing with dissent made it a teaching tool for its creators, and a pertinent lesson for its readers.

5. Hunting Conclusions

The first aim of the project has been to make a convincing case that the hunt was either directly experienced or indirectly observed by most individuals from the beginning of Elizabeth I's reign to Charles I's execution. Using a diary, a personal poem and historical documents, the first chapter showed that the participation extended through all strata of society. The second aim was to discuss the way writers used it. Using an approach based on genre, the middle three chapters focused on the many instances of predation in poetry, plays and prose fiction. This evidence supports the premise that the sport was a major part of the culture and the dominant theme in the literature.

Nicholas Orme rightly comments that "hunting is remarkably diverse in its topography, the beasts pursued, the types of hounds, the age, gender, and ranks of the hunters, and the culture of customs, artifacts, art, and literature to which it gave rise" (147). The critic speaks of a variety of hunting variables but an even greater range of hunts has been presented in the project. This chapter will place the early modern hunt in a wider context. Beginning with an archeological and anthropological examination of the place of the hunt in culture, it will present an overview of the focus period. The chapter will end with analysis of the presence of the hunt in

the daily and cultural life after 1649.

5.1 Pre-1558

Archeologists speculate widely on the move from the gathering/vegetarian to a hunting/carnivorous diet. Gathering is an activity in which no special aptitude is required. Since food gathering is egalitarian, its social organization is flat. Hunting uses a vertical model because only a few have the skills required to be successful predators. William Laughlin argues the shift was a major evolutionary step and the "master behaviour pattern of the human species" (304). It transformed a "bipedal ape into a tool-using and tool-making man who communicate[s] by means of speech and expresse[s] a complex culture" (Laughlin 318). John Mackenzie looks at the change in a different way. He postulates that, since man is physically under-equipped for the hunt, this activity made the creation of hunting weapons and butchering tools a necessity and thus begins the "origins of material culture" (7). Co-operative hunting is also an important aspect for it marks the beginning of social interaction. Michael Dietler sees the link between hunting and social evolution a little differently because food and particularly sharing were the methods for acquiring power over others (88). He admits that archeological evidence is slim but surmises that hunting patterns created large congregations (101)

and that feasts were a means for successful hunters or leaders of hunting groups to acquire prestige and status (100). The transition from horizontal gathering to vertical hunting society had repercussions on artistic production. The drawings of animals in cave walls acknowledged the culture's interest in reproducing desirable prey was an attempt to ensure success in hunting.

While archeologists view artefacts and speculate about the societies which created them, anthropologists examine contemporary cultures and try to see patterns. Polly Wiessner at least partially contradicts the vertical/hunter model in her investigation of twenty-seven contemporary hunter-gatherer groups. She finds that most societies allow some acclaim and/or praise but few grant "prestige" to good hunters (176). The method they use for curtailing possible domination by the hunter is to diminish the obligation implied in his provision of meat. Instead of direct gifts from him, more indirect waves of distribution within clans and families are used and thus it is the hunter's duty to others which is emphasized (184).

5.2 1559-1649

In early modern England, it was not hunting prowess which created membership in the elite. By the time, it was birth and/or wealth which entrenched the hierarchy. But that is not to say that members of the elite

were not hunters. In the medieval and early modern period, the hunt was undertaken as a recreation by the privileged and those who wanted to occupy a similar position. In his discussion of the importance of the English country house, Mark Girouard points out that "people did not live in [them] unless they either possessed power, or, by setting up a country house, were making a bid to possess it" (2).

What set the early modern hunter apart from those in other periods and other cultures was that he was not the sole provider of animal protein. In the 1542-1560 accounts of Mary of Guise, beef, mutton, lamb, kids, capons, chickens, pigeons, blackcock and moorfowl (when in season) as well as a wide variety of salted and fresh fish (Marshall 141) are mentioned for her own household and the *cuisine de commun*. This record shows that there was no shortage of protein in their diet, even when venison was not on the menu. Venison was eaten by aristocrats and the gentry and Assheton most likely ate it as well as numerous other kinds of game and domesticated meats at a feast with James I in August 1617 (Nichols *James I* 42-3). The sheer variety of protein available meant that the hunters did not have sole responsibility for holding starvation at bay. Game was a minor but elite supplement rather than the major source of protein.

The hunter in the period was also different from other cultures because he had little interest in other rural folk and thus did not distribute the bounty. His pursuit of prey was considered one of the preferable ways for a gentleman to take exercise rather than a way to increase status in the

eyes of others. As well, the successful hunter did not divide his kill to solidify social ties. For example, Lady Margaret Hoby's present to her "Cossine bouser [of] some venison" (July 30-31, 1600, 102) was quickly mentioned and passed over. Indeed, the early modern predator did not hunt out of necessity but because it was his desire, because game was plentiful, and because no one stopped him.

The abundance of wild game diminished over the period. Increasing cultivation and forest clearance created a decline in suitable habitat and led to less prey being available. This diminishment of wild game did not lead to less hunting but rather the reverse. By the sixteenth century, lesser nobility were "much occupied with building new manor-houses and imparking (by royal assent) much common land, forest and open woodland to form private hunting preserves and deer parks" (Vandervell and Coles 24-5). What changed was the intertwined aspects of what was hunted and who hunted it. The "what" factor altered because the prey was no longer wild. The prey was now brought into an enclosed setting and treated as edible pets. The "who" changed because wealth rather than pedigree gave an expanded group of people access to the sport. No longer the domain of the monarch and a few favourites, it became more widespread.

Another change was that predation began to be criticized. One of its earlier detractors was Margaret Cavendish. As a girl raised in the country

within a wealthy family, she knew first-hand the intricacies of the hunt and explicitly referred to them in two of the poems she published in 1653. What makes her work stand out is her commitment to the prey. In "The Hunt of the Hare," Cavendish's anthropomorphic approach to the slaughter of a hare cannot be considered conventional. She names the beast and this gesture alone sets her apart from other writers within the project. Since the title alludes to the probability of its death, the drama of the highly coloured poem is not the hare's slaughter but rather the description of the pursuit. The third-person narrator does not side with the hunters but instead, he (or she) is highly sympathetic to the victim's predicament. From the opening lines describing the hare trying to flatten himself to the ground in the hopes of becoming less visible, the narrator paints a picture of brutality. A twenty-line "lecture" (83-106) ends the poem. It is here that Cavendish moves from the gory particulars to argue more broadly against the sport. The narrator systematically counters each of the common arguments in favour of hunting (a preparation for war, part of a healthy lifestyle, and nourishment) and aligns it with murder and tyranny. In this strongly-worded anti-hunting manifesto, Cavendish simultaneously shows her knowledge of the details of the hunt and her critical distance from hunting culture.

The actual hunt had an eloquent critic but her views were not shared by many other early modern writers. A significant number of them

put the sport in their works in one way or another. As mentioned in the preceding section, artists in earlier cultures drew pictures of desirable prey. They probably also composed songs to bring them luck in their own expeditions. Early modern writers did much the same thing but for different reasons. They wrote about the hunt, not to bring them luck, but to describe more fully this aspect of early modern English life. These writers did not stop at realistic representation. They also used it metaphorically to add complexity to their poems, plays and prose fiction tales.

The erotic chase for domination between men and women was also a part of the literature of the period. In its poetic form, the persona or lover was the only fully characterized individual. An almost empty landscape would seem to preclude predation but that was not the case. The differences between outsiders such as Cupid, the beloved and the persona/lover were intensified through hunting terminology. The sadomasochistic aspects of an armed individual and an unarmed one were apparent. Poems with a narrator did not rely on an introspective persona/narrator. Instead, the narrator used predatory terms to describe the characters and their dynamics. The erotic hunt did not end with poetry but continued in drama. Unlike the small highly personal world of poetry, playwrights allowed each partner a speaking role. This equality was undercut by the use of hunting terminology to depict the details of the

gendered relationship. In comedies, relations were between two knowing partners and they were often depicted in terms of predator and prey. In tragedies, the erotic hunt was most often bleaker. Prose fiction writers continued in the footsteps set down by the playwrights but with certain variations. In the romances, each partner was knowledgeable in the intricacies of flirtation and thus predation was relatively playful and subject to role reversals. The same cannot be said of the picaresque tales with monetary exchange being at the heart of that erotic chase.

The overview of the genres shows considerable variation in the depiction of the erotic hunt from schizophrenic to joyous to bleak. The continuous thread throughout them was that the female character was the prominent partner. In each of these genres, writers choose not to adopt a patriarchal model. Instead of an overpowering male predator and a weak female prey, each group varied the social paradigm. While the dramatic and fictional writers allowed dominance to fluctuate between the partners, the poets went further. The hunting beloved and the preyed-upon lover rarely alternated roles or stepped out of their established set of characteristics. Linda Woodbridge captures the essence of the poetic dynamic when she states that it is "the repeated push of the masochistic tongue against the exquisitely aching tooth of unrequited love" (186). Poetic predation served a simplistic and a complex function. It was simplistic because each incident remained fundamentally the same and thus usage was relatively unoriginal. It is true that the beloved was on

occasion a ferocious animal but this was only a superficial change. She remained the predator. For early modern poets, the hunt was a formulaic response to the perceived persecution of one individual by another. What made this form of persecution complex was that the poetic picture of an individual man being downtrodden by a dangerously dominating woman did not easily mesh with the patriarchal norm in which the poet lived. The real and the fictional worlds were not mirrors of each other.

To get a sense of the erotic reality in the early modern period, one need only look at an undated letter Maria Thynne wrote to her husband Thomas. In her opening remarks, Maria speaks of "thy kindness to [her], thy doggs thy hawkes the hare and the foxes" (76). While she put herself in the premier position amongst his predation assistants and prey, it cannot be overlooked that she was the only human amongst his hunting interests. This letter lends credence to Woodbridge's questions about whether the early modern literary depiction can be "taken seriously as a symbol of women's enhanced stature in the real world" (186). Her analysis shows that the elevation of women in poetry is "chiefly a literary game" (185) and she provides many examples of their denigration in the popular literature of the time. Anthony Fletcher underscores this when he says that "simple misogyny as upon anxiety and fears about women's assertiveness and independence in speech and action, fears which often [come] back to their sexuality" (401-2). The poetic hunt gave the reader a highly controversial

view of gender relations within the "safe environment" of the imagination.

Tragedians and picaresque prose writers in early modern England saw the hunt as a way to underscore unequal dynamics. Comic and romance prose writers used to underline the inherent predatory characteristics of much human interaction, and to provide comment on either a character or society at large. Since the goal of most interpersonal domination was to create and sustain inequality, such dynamics pointed to chronic instability. The hunt served straightforward and complex metaphoric functions. It was straightforward because the hunt was about a "relationship in which two systems of instincts confront each other: the aggressive instincts of the hunter and the defensive instincts of the game" (Ortega y Gasset 87). What this meant in metaphoric social terms was that there was an ongoing motif without a clear winner. In the plays, dominant individuals (especially in the tragedies) were often portrayed as temporary residents of that position with a fall from power near at hand. The hunt was not just a literary shorthand for unequal dynamics. It signaled the instability of power and ultimately the illusory qualities of social permanence. What is important about the conclusion is that it provides insight into the complex relationship between the artist and the culture. In the first chapter, I referred to Lauro Martines's remarks that any creative act bore the marks of the wider social milieu. My analysis of hunt culture supports that viewpoint but only up to a point. The writers of the period

lived in a hunt-saturated society. When the violence and aggressiveness of the hunt were applied to fictional interpersonal relationships, the tension between the dominator and the dominated remained. The question becomes whether writers reflected their social milieu by including the sport. In other words, did they also mirror the tensions they saw around them or were their creations literary constructs? The hunt metaphor in plays and prose fiction reveals a social tension not previously discussed. Just as the poetic hunt shows anxiety about female domination and persecution, the hunt in plays and prose fiction outlines a similar but significantly wider concern. Literary predation also points to a commonality between new and old historicism. New historicists are "preoccupied with power relations and operations" (Somerset 245) and see literature as further historical evidence. Old historicists privilege literature as a special type of discourse which illustrates the given facts of society (Somerset 245). Neither of these historical approaches addresses the almost universal uncertainty signaled by the erotic and the social hunts. Not all old historicists fail to point to cracks in the social order. For all of his laying out of a highly ordered celestial and earthly world in *The Elizabethan World Picture,* even E. M. W. Tillyard admits that medieval correspondences fail to satisfy the latter society's desires for order (92). The rigidity of its order serves as "a fixed pattern before which the fierce variety of real life could be transacted and to which it could be referred"

(Tillyard 92). This is the closest Tillyard comes to discussing underlying insecurities and it is not the "conflict-free society" (Jardine 286) his critics foist upon him. Other critics focus on this kind of underlying tension. Jonathan Dollimore sees "ideology as a process of conspiracy on the part of the rulers and misrecognition on the part of the ruled" (9). David Norbrook emphasizes the subversion rather than reinforcement of the Elizabethan world picture in texts. Although he does not point to metaphor (or more specifically hunting metaphors) as one of these subversive techniques, he feels that "rhetoric in the early modern period was indeed a critical political force" (141). Norbrook is suggestive of my approach but Albert Tricomi is even more so. Like him, I seek "to revise the dominant new-historicist proposition that texts reproduce culture" (1) and demonstrate the "relationship between social structure and social practices and textual articulations ... [and thus decipher] the symbolic codes that underlie semiotic processes" (2). Mary Douglas and Victor Turner focus on much the same cluster of concepts when they describe the cultural projections and foundation metaphors. In early modern English society, the hunt occupied a prominent liminal position between reality and imagination: the actual and the metaphor.

5.3 Post 1649

The Interregnum led to a neglect of deer parks but alternative forms of hunting remained popular in the following centuries. Smaller game such as foxes (Carr 25) and partridges (MacKenzie 18) gained popularity. For those who had the wealth and the desire, there was always Scotland for deer hunting and, more importantly, the empire for exotic game in southern Africa and India. Indeed, John MacKenzie feels that the exploitation of wild animals played a significant role in British imperialism of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (7). Patricia Anderson goes so far as to link the Victorian hunt to male sexual purity. Chases in England, Scotland or parts of the empire were considered manly pursuits and left the hunter with "the exhilarating release from tension that came with the kill" (56) which acted as a substitute for more intimate sexual release. Maureen Duffy's discussion of the hunt makes the sexual links even more explicit. She sees the chase as a form of ritualistic rape.

Anti-hunting manifestos did not diminish over the years. Percy Shelley wrote a short passionate essay, "On the Game Laws," in which he does not argue that the sport is cruel to animals but rather that it is unfair to many humans. He sees hunting as an example of "a distinction of ranks ... so that one man enjoys all the productions of human art and industry without any exertion of his own, whilst another earns the right of seeing his wife and children famish before his eyes, by providing for the superfluous luxuries of the former" (I.280). One of the most significant modern anti-hunt statements comes from an unusual source: a Walt

Disney movie. Matt Cartmill argues that a distaste for hunting expanded considerably with the 1942 release of *Bambi*. He considers the film one of the "most powerful pieces of antihunting propaganda ever produced" (162). The aim of this anthropomorphic film was to heighten sympathy for the prey and persuade young children that hunting was cruel and heartless. For most of the generations who have seen the movie, the indelible message became that all hunting meant killing lovable Bambi. These Bambi syndrome adherents existed in England and they protested regularly. Distress over hunting continues into the present with an increasingly vocal English pro-fox/anti-hunting lobby. Tackling the wider issue of meat consumption, ecofeminists such as Carol Adams make a direct connection between hunting carnivores and the rape of women. Despite opposition, hunting continues to be actively supported by many including the British Royal Family. Writing in the mid-1990s, Michael Billett estimates five million people in Britain were continuing to show an interest in country sports (11).

One aspect of the hunt which is also a part of present predation is stalking and serial killings. As the terms imply, both activities involve a kind of methodical pursuit which is the hallmark of the hunt. Criminal stalking is a pattern of intrusion upon another person which is unwanted and potentially threatening (Meloy 2). As Glen Skoler points out, "hunting reflects the human fascination with stalking" (103) and the line between

appropriate and inappropriate prey is crossed. This activity is most often the male pursuit of women and thus the behaviour has been called a courtship disorder (Meloy 5). Elliott Leyton states that the form of the hunt is an "extended campaign of vengeance, [in which the perpetrator often] murders people unknown to him, but who represent ... the class that has rejected him" (23). Inadequacy and perceived rejection feed the stalker's anger and sometimes lead to overt aggression. Skoler finds examples of this behaviour in the wounded, imprisoned and enslaved personas of the sonnet tradition (93) but I would argue that it appears in many of the erotic hunts in the project. It has moved, however, beyond the literary into the lives of men and their female victims. The multiple or serial killer is another aspect of the same phenomenon. Since the modern equivalent is a *lustmord* or joy-murderer (Leyton 26), he derives intense satisfaction from his hunting activities. If the act itself is pleasurable, at least part of the interest is in specimens. Surprisingly, this kind of hunter has a somewhat twisted counterpart in the early modern reader of hunting manuals. While the serial murderer attacks those who reject him, the earlier individual was more optimistic. He wished to acquire the outward finesse of hunting culture to increase his chances of higher status.

Literary interest in the sport extended far beyond 1649. Writing on hunting in eighteenth century verse, Eric Rothstein surveys its abundant

use from Alexander Pope's *Windsor-Forest* (1713) to Gerald Fitzgerald's *The Academick Sportsman: or, a Winter's Day* (1773). He concludes that the period had an ambivalent attitude towards the sport. The hunt was a healthy exercise in an established rural tradition but many writers described the pain of the anthropomorphized prey. Like Cavendish, Wordsworth's sympathy is with the animals. In "Hart-Leap Well," which is his "only significant poem on the topic" (Perkins 422), Wordsworth focuses on the "murder" (II. 137) of a stag. Thomas Hardy concerns himself with the pain of a hunted animal (Evers 18). His most prominent fictional example is the use of the prey in *Tess of the D'Urbervilles.* Almost the earliest reference of Tess is to her wearing a red ribbon (14) and she continues to be associated with blood, wounds, and defenseless animals. He clearly makes her an object of violent predation throughout the novel. No less a poet than Ted Hughes uses animal predators extensively in his early poems. Predator-and-prey dynamics also continue to play a major role in the chase motif in detective fiction and fast paced Hollywood movies.

Three other writers — Samuel Richardson, Jane Austen, and D.H. Lawrence — all make use of the erotic hunt in their works. The major motif of Richardson's lengthy epistolary novel, *Clarissa,* is Robert Lovelace's unrelenting and erotically focused hunt on Clarissa Harlowe (Bohde 45). A more nuanced rendering of the sport occurs in Jane Austen's novels, for

the hunters are most often the characters who behave "improperly" (Kulisheck 23) towards women. Jane Austen refers briefly to hunting in her minor novels (*Lady Susan* and *The Watsons)* but it is major characters such as Henry Crawford (*Mansfield Park)* and John Willoughby (*Sense and Sensibility)* whose predatory habits translate into an interest in seduction. D. H. Lawrence sees the hunt as the "male predator's desire to kill and his desire to mate, ... desiring a death of some sort, like the deer, or the rabbit" (Whelan 278 discussing *The Fox*). In his writing, he thinks of a woman as a victim who inevitably succumbs to the "peace" of male superiority. Charles Dickens uses the urban social hunt in one of his novels, *Oliver Twist*. His remark that "[t]here is a passion *for hunting something* deeply implanted in the human breast" (74) is often cited as support for the innate rightness of the sport in modern life. What is overlooked is its context. Dickens interjects the comment during a crowd's energetic pursuit of Oliver after a pickpocketing incident. Oliver is innocent, for he witnesses but does not participate in the Dodger's theft of a handkerchief. Dickens's choice of the word "something" is apt. He points to the crowd's ability to substitute an innocent for the culprit just for the excitement of the chase. By compressing actual and the metaphoric pursuits, the Victorian writer described a social situation in predatory terms.

Closer to our own time, the hunt is prevalent in romance novels. According to Cynthia Whissell's analysis, the romance novel (published by

Harlequin and dozens of others) develops the theme through four stages: introduction, set-up, body, and dénouement (92). The introduction and set-up fill in the background of the male and female protagonists, while the body describes the repetitive interaction between the hero and heroine. Whissell calls this the "thrust-and-parry pas de deux" which forms a "pattern of alternating advances and retreats" (93). I would call it erotic hunting. The dénouement is not a kill nor even a rape but rather the proposal of marriage. The fact that erotic predation is as popular now as it was several hundred years ago should not be a surprise. Janice Radway indirectly addresses the longevity of erotic hunt usage when she examines the importance of the romance genre for female readers. She thinks that the subliminal interest in the modern romantic genre is the "imaginative transformation of masculinity to conform with female standards" (147), with the hero's original presentation as "hard, angular, and dark" (128) changing into "sensitive, expressive and overly appreciative of the heroine's extraordinary qualities" (131) by book's end. This re-arrangement of fundamental parts of patriarchally prescribed masculine behaviour allows female readers to experience a world unavailable in the rest of their lives. In an ironic twist, the apprehensions about the other gender drive both the early modern erotic poetry and contemporary romance fiction. In the first example, the male poet imaginatively confronts his apprehension about female abilities. In the second, the

romance writer reshapes masculine behaviour vicariously to appease female distaste for traditional roles.

My exploration of early modern poetry, plays and prose fiction in terms of the hunt is important because it analyzes a significant cultural practice and its representation, and attempts to contribute to a more complex vision of early modern culture. Initially, the dialectical hunt paradigm of the strong and the weak, or the overbearing and the passive, could be seen as formulaic. But it points to the potential overturning of positions for those who were conquered. They too could become tyrants. What the metaphor finally says about early modern society is that the static social hierarchy so often associated with it is a false model. It should be replaced with one which at least vicariously is associated with fluid reversals of position. The dialectic of predator and prey illuminated interpersonal dynamics of the time and outlined a continuity with the present. Just as in the present, writers in the early modern period reflected the predominant social dynamics in their literature and they did this to link the audience to its contents. As a result, a number of intense human activities— courtship, revenge and aggrandizement — were and continue to be seen by both writer and audience as predatory.

Endnotes

1.

1. My modern use of predation is not without precedent in literary analysis. Critical terms, such as problem play, have been used today in relation to early modern writers who, however. did not use such words.

2. Raised in a "prosperous gentry family," Gascoigne squandered his fortune in an effort to gain a place at court (Pigman Biographical Introduction xxiv-vi). His lack of success in hunting can be seen as one of his many unsuccessful attempts to be accepted by the elite.

2. Aemilia Lanyer's "The Description of Cooke-Ham" gives a different view of country life and the place of the hunt. Instead of the highly competitive environment, Lanyer paints a picture of a co-operative and female-centred Eden. She does describe a bow in the Countess of Cumberland's hand but far from being a destructive instrument it is an allusion to Diana and indirectly to Elizabeth I. The Queene was often described as this goddess (Notes 305). This single hunting allusion is used to elevate the Countess to the status of goddess and monarch.

3. Niccolò Machiavelli recommends that the prince "must always be out hunting, so accustoming his body to hardships and also learning some

practical geography" (88). He also sees the hunt as a practical way to learn to outwit and to track down the prey. In other words, the hunt organizes aggressive impulses towards a single prey and simultaneously sharpens the individual's ability to serve his prince/monarch in war.

4. The modern copy is a reprint of an 1848 edition. The original manuscript was "a few diminutive, loose, and disarranged leaves" (Raines xxix) in which Assheton commits to "paper [his daily life] without the remotest thought of ever being" published (Raines ix).

5. During the twenty-one months he records, Assheton makes mention of "sixteen fox chases, ten stag hunts, two of the buck, as many of the otter and hare, one of the badger, four days each of grouse shooting, the same of fishing ... and two of hawking (Raines xxvi). Assheton also makes frequent reference to his intemperance. F. R. Raines records that he is "merrie" eleven times, "verie merrie" once, "more than merie" once, "merrie as Robin Hood" once, "plaid the bacchanalian" once, "somewhat too busie with drink" once, "sicke with drinke" once, "foolish" once, and "fooled this day worse" once (Raines xxvi).

6. Assheton seems to reveal all of his failings but there is one aspect of his life which he possibly does not divulge: his sexual escapades.

Referring to Assheton, William Ainsworth writes that he "cannot uphold the squire as a model of conjugal fidelity. Report affirmed that he loved more than one pretty girl under the rose" (79). Since there is no corroborating evidence, these comments may be untrue. It is, however, in keeping with his minimal mention of his wife and his freewheeling bacchanalian spirit.

7. Elizabeth I was fond of hunting expeditions but her total expenditures on the sport were relatively low: the cost was £100 in 1561 (Hore 59), £86 a year from 1562 to 1567 (Hore 60) and £140 a year from 1589 to 1602 (Hore 75). These amounts were small because she often indulged her interest at someone else's expense during her annual progresses through the English countryside. In 1574, for example, "many deare coursed with grey hounds were overturned" by the Queen and her courtiers during a visit to Claringdon Park (Nichols *Elizabeth* 1: 19). Discussing a 1575 hunt at Kenilworth, Robert Laneham described two incidents of the "delectabl" (Nichols *Elizabeth* 1: 12) pastime of noisy and boisterous July afternoon hunts for single deer (Nichols *Elizabeth* 1: 12, 26). The monarch enjoyed the hunt throughout her life but her method of participation did, at times, change. In a 1591 description of a hunt at Cowdray, the fifty-eight-year old monarch shot at deer herded into a paddock. Later in the same day, she watched from a turret as greyhounds

pulled down bucks (Nichols *Elizabeth* 2:2). In a letter to Robert Sidney, Rowland Whyte described the sixty-seven year old Queen as riding and hunting every other day during her 1600 progress (Nichols *Elizabeth* 2:4).

James I was a more avid hunter than Elizabeth. An early indication of his passion was that he made at least three hunting excursions during his journey from Edinburgh to London to be proclaimed King in 1603 (Nichols, *Elizabeth* 3:9, 14, 16). His interest can also be seen in his spending. Given that his predecessor's spending in this area hovered at £100, his expenditure of £642 (Hore 98) during his first year was a sizeable increase. It rose steadily. In 1607-8 he spent £1,045 (Hore 104). It would seem that the King's interest in spending on the hunt waned to a more manageable £760 (Hore 109) in 1612-14 but Prince Charles had his own pack and this cost was not included in the royal accounts. When Prince Charles's expenditure of £427 (Hore 131) was added, a total amount of £1,185 was spent by the royal household. These figures for father (between £600 and £700 a year) and son (between £400 and £500) did not vary significantly during the remainder of James's life. Anecdotal evidence also provides a picture of the interest James had for the sport. In his *Memoirs,* James Wellwood wrote that the King divided his time "betwixt his Standish [a stand containing writing materials, *OED*], his Bottle, and his Hunting" (41). Others saw hunting as taking precedence over all other activities. Arbella Stuart noted that there was "eve[r]lasting

hunting" (186) at his 1603 court. Thomas Wilson gave an indication of the king's priorities when he stated "[s]ometymes he [James] comes to Counsell, but most tyme he spends in fieldes and parkes and chaces, chasinge away idlenes by violent exercise and early risinge" (June 22, 1603 letter from Thomas Wilson to Sir Thomas Parry, Nicholas *James* 1:188). Indeed, Francis Osborne was emphatic in his view of the King when he wrote that one man in his reign

> might with some safety have killed another, than a raskall-Deare; [b]ut if a stagg had been knowne to have miscarried and the authour fled, a Proclamation with a description of the party had been penned by the Attourney-general, and the penalty of his Majesties high displeasure ... threatned against all that did abet, comfort or relieve him. Thus Satyrical, or if you please Tragical, was this Sylvan Prince against Dear-killers, and indulgent to man-slayers (53-4)

The extent of public (and private) acknowledgement of the king's obsessiveness about the sport came to light in an incident involving one of his hunting dogs named Jowler. The dog went missing and when it returned it wore a sign around its neck: "Good Mr. Jowler, we pray you speake to the King (for he hears you every day so doth he not us) that it will please his Majesty to go back to London, for els the country wil be

undoon; all our provition is spent already, and we are not able to intertayne him longer" (November 7, 1604 letter from Edmund Lascelles to the Earl of Shrewsbury, Nichols *James* 1:464-5). Although the incident was considered a "jeast, and so pas'd over" (Nichols *James* 1:465), James continued to delegate much of the country's business to administrators and the approach soon became a matter of policy. By 1605, the King saw hunting as the only means of remaining healthy. He desired the Council "to take the charge and burden of affairs, and forsee that he be not interrupted or *troubled with too much business*" (author's italics; January 26, 1605 letter from John Chamberlain to Francis Winwood, Nichols *James* 1:491; *Chamberlain Letters* 35; Winwood 2:46). James's interest was a source (briefly) of some marital conflict. The Queen inadvertently killed "Jewell the King's most special and favourite hound" during a hunt (August 1, 1613 letter from John Chamberlain to Sir Dudley Carleton; Nichols *James* 2:671). Although she was quickly forgiven by the King, the incident was important because it made clear that a woman of rank hunted and also that the couple shared the same recreational interest. Both the King and Queen saw themselves as hunters. A childhood portrait of the King portrayed him as a falconer (Bevan n.p.). One of the Queen's adult portraits showed her as a stylishly attired hunter beside her horse and surrounded by greyhounds (Bevan n.p.).

Their son, Charles, was an even more enthusiastic supporter of the

sport. During the first year of his reign (1625-6), Charles spent £919 (Hore 121) and the figure increased every year. By 1639-40 (the last complete record), the expenditure reached £1,340 (Hore 127). Given the amount of money he spent, the hunt was his chief preoccupation. Some observers went so far as to describe his court as passing "over the land like a swarm of locusts in pursuit of game, moving on once an area was swept clean, going from house to house, palace to hunting lodge, with the minimum of display" (Carlton 129). Charles's love of hunting can be seen as leading directly to his downfall. When Charles hunted near Daventry, he realized too late that anti-royalist forces were close to him. His unpreparedness caused him to lose the battle of Naseby and the defeat proved "the decisive moment that the King sought — and lost" (Carlton 287).

Oliver Cromwell was also a hunter. Born into a family whose wealth began with Henry VIII's patronage (Fraser 7), he grew up a gentleman and thus had a long-standing interest in hunting and hawking (Young 16). His interest was reflected in the fact that two falconers, a huntsman and a bird keeper were part of his staff at Hampton Court (Sherwood 171). These same individuals accompanied his funeral cortège (Sherwood 85).

8. I use the King James version in this quotation but there is little difference in wording or intent in the Geneva Bible. In the earlier version of the same passage, God gave man "rule over the fish of the sea, and over

the foule of the heaven, and over the beastes, & over all the earth, and over everie thing that crepeth & moveth on the earth."

9. Technically, only the monarch hunted in the aptly named royal forest but he or she granted privileges to favourites. Traditionally, freeholders with estates worth 40 shillings a year could hunt on their own holdings within the deforested areas of royal forests (Manning 83). One of James I's unpopular acts was to increase the hunting qualification to £10. The change led to an increase in poaching (Manning 85).

10. *Calendar of New Forest Documents* is a collection of court proceedings. What is of interest is the difference in offences between the earlier (1487-1494) and the later (1634-1635) period. In the preface to these documents, D. J. Stagg writes that the majority of the earlier proceedings dealt with infractions concerning deer and this confirms that the "primary importance of the Forest was still as a game reserve" (ix). By the seventeenth century, the emphasis was on vert (timber cutting) offences (Stagg x). This change in type of offence points to a decline in the deer population by the first third of the seventeenth century. In his discussion of the rise of English fox hunting, Raymond Carr confirms the change. He notes that deer became increasingly rare by the late seventeenth century. The most significant factor in the decrease was the

clearing of deer habitat for pasture and for arable land. He does not discuss whether decades of interest in the sport by aristocrats and the gentry led to a decrease in the number of deer available.

11. The man-made boundaries between the park and the world outside were friction points between aristocrat and commoner. Since the parks were often poorly maintained, deer moved outside the park's parameters and caused animosity amongst the farmers. Charles I took royal prerogative and enclosure to an extreme in 1636 when he constructed a high brick wall around everything between Hampton Court and Richmond (Manning 120).

12. My attention rests on the recreational pursuits of the elite but this is not the only social strata which was involved in hunting. Writing about medieval hunting, Nicholas Orme comments that the "majority of hunters may well have been members of the lower orders" (136). These individuals acted as both forest law enforcement officers and servants who prepared and assisted with the chase. There is no reason to believe that paid foresters and parkers did not fulfill much the same function in later hunting culture. Sadly, these workers did not write about their jobs nor did others include them in their accounts. Their presence as hunting facilitators can be assumed which means there was widespread non-elite participation in and knowledge of hunting.

13. *The Noble Arte of Venerie* was first published anonymously in 1575 for C[hristopher]Barker (Pollard and Redgrave 24328). Apart from these fundamental facts, there is much dispute over authorship and sources. *The English Short Title Catalogue* lists George Gascoigne as author. The entry also mentions that the book was usually bound with George Turberville's *The Book of Falconrie or Hawking* and that Turberville is "sometimes" considered the author. I will use *The English Short Title Catalogue's* main entry and refer to Gascoigne as the author. Another area of dispute is the author's sources. *The English Short Title Catalogue* considers it "an adaptation" of Jacques du Fouilloux's *La vénerie* while G. W. Pigman disputes this single source and feels it is "largely a translation of treatises by Jacques du Fouilloux and Gaston de Foix" (xxxix).

14. *A Short Treatise of Hunting* by Thomas Cockayne was first published in 1591 for T[homas] Woodcocke (Pollard and Redgrave 5457).

15. The final section — "Sir Tristrams measures of *blowing*" — is a noteworthy appendix. A similar section, "The measures of blowing, " appears in Gascoigne's book, complete with musical notation. Cockayne does not expect musical training and thus he gives his instructions in

words. What readers would find interesting is that Gascoigne's and Cockayne's lists are different. In Gascoigne's "the death of a foxe, eyther in fielde or couert" [153], it is a grouping of three four-note sequences with a double and a long note, which are sounded three times (Appendix n.p.). In Cockayne's "To blow the death of the Foxe in Field or Couert," it is "three notes, with three winds, the rechase upon the same with three windes: the first wind, one long and five short; the second, one short and one long; and the third, one long and five short" (n.p.). It is difficult to know whether these variations were related to regional differences or alteration over time (there was a fifteen year gap between publication dates) of horn communications but such differences could easily lead to confusing situations amongst huntsmen who read different manuals.

16. Gervase Markham published *Country Contentments* in 1615 for R[oger] Jackson and it was "to be sold at his shop neere Fleet-street Conduit" (*English Short Title Catalogue)*. This location is confirmed in *A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers* (Aldis 151). The first edition contained *The English housewife* but there was considerable variation in the material included in subsequent editions. At least two other book shops — John Harison "at the golden Unicorne in Pater-noster-row" in 1631 and 1633 (*English Short Title Catalogue)* and E[dward] Brewster and George Sawbridge "at the Bible on Ludgate-hill, neere Fleet-bridge" in

1654 (UMI 1487:19) — produced the volume. All of the locations mentioned in Markham's work were near St. Paul's Churchyard.

17. In the introduction to his edition of Markham's *The English Housewife,* Michael Best writes that the turning point in the author's life came in 1609. At this point, he married and became a husbandman or a farmer whose living depended on the land (xiii). This occupation did not provide enough income for his family during the nine years (Best xiii) he pursued it, but it did furnish him with much of the material for the numerous books he wrote about horses, husbandry, sports and recreations. Markham also wrote poetry and plays and occupied a position on "the fringes of the literary world" (Best xv). It was works such as *Husbandmans Recreations* which provided him with much of his income.

18. My intention is to establish a correspondence between social and literary practices. The society presented in literature is not a direct mirror of contemporary life but contains substantial direct and indirect contemporary social references. What becomes important then is what is transferred. At least two factors — individual imagination and collective literary tradition — also have a bearing of the literary outcome. The writer's imagination draws underlying principles from his or her social world and these examples appear in the literature. It is the point of origin

(the social milieu) and what the writer reveals about it which is important. Literary traditions also have a bearing on the final product. For example, Petrarchism with its reliance on oxymoron concepts such as hunter and hunted can also be seen as influential. This tradition has a bearing on the writer but does not negate his or her cultural "upbringing." It is this combination of social underpinnings, imagination and traditions which influence the writer's outpourings. All of these factors hover in the background of any analysis of metaphorical relationships but it is my intention to highlight the less explored area: the link between the social and the literary.

19. In *The Forest of Medieval Romance,* Corrine Saunders argues that the forest provides an "archetypal romance landscape" which goes "far beyond its obvious associations with darkness and danger, incorporating the themes of adventure, love, and spiritual vision" (ix). Her study focuses on Biblical and classical antecedents but her investigation shows that both medieval and the early modern writers shared similar traditions.

20. Metaphor was both highly accepted and often used in the period. There are a number of modern views on the figurative device. The interactive model, for example, has been termed the "most popular or dominant view of metaphor in contemporary philosophical literature"

(Tilley 13). Unlike the substitution view which regards the metaphor as a replacement of one set with another set of components, or the comparison view which regards the metaphor as a literal paraphrase of a simile (Black 27), the interactive view reflects the desire on the part of the human mind to connect two things in a large number of different ways. The interactive view was first introduced by I. A. Richards who dubbed the metaphor a "double unit" (96) with a tenor — or underlying idea — and a vehicle — or its imagined nature. Max Black expanded Richards's initial categorization. He saw two subjects — primary and secondary — in a metaphorical statement. The primary subject of a metaphor was the focus while the secondary was the frame into which it was put. Using the two-step model, the later theorist defined a metaphor as "an instrument for drawing implications grounded in perceived analogies of structure between two subjects belonging to different domains" (31). This modern linguistic explanation describes the appeal of metaphor but the rhetorical figure does incite strong opinions. Peter Platt argues that rhetorical tricks such as metaphor transform the literal meaning into the figurative and thus lead to "something fictitious, constructed, and potentially false" (279). Patricia Parker, on the other hand, sees metaphor as a "violation of boundaries" (39) and the transfer "inseparable from a kind of violence" (38) and impropriety. Although each of these critics approaches metaphor differently, the conclusions are similar. They feel that the metaphorical links by the author make it potentially dangerous. The importance of the

metaphor to be examined within the project — the hunt in literature — lies in what it implicitly states about the surrounding culture.

In all probability, Black would feel that there is a fundamental problem with such an approach. He sees metaphors as imaginative responses by individual writers who wish to offer insight by providing unusual juxtapositions. Thus he finds any metaphor that becomes standard within a culture "untenable" (24). This is at odds with my position that the use of the hunt points to an underpinning of cultural thinking rather than the product of individual insight. Unlike Black, I feel that individual creativity in the realm of metaphor is not the only way of looking at its use. As I intend to prove in the following chapters, individual creativity is at work but it all occurs within the hunt's use as a broadly based cultural metaphor. To me, the concluding statement in Black's article about metaphors being a way to convey "insight into the systems to which they refer ... [and that] can, and sometimes do, generate insight about 'how things are' in reality" (39) is applicable and relevant to this aspect of the project.

21. In *Distinction,* Pierre Bourdieu's discussions of class and culture come close to my position but from a different direction. His analysis of twentieth century French culture concludes that there is an "opposition between the dominant and the dominated" (469). His sense of

oppositional forces is not founded on a cultural product such as literature but rather on the class and/or educational differences between the producers and consumers. Although class (and education) create major divisions in early modern society, it is not my aim to analyze these aspects directly. Instead, as a literary critic, I examine the cultural outpourings and establish from that data underlying social principles.

2.

1. In *Eros the Bittersweet,* Anne Carson focuses on classical poetry and discusses the many references to painful love. She sees erotic dynamics as a triangle: lover and beloved, and "that which comes between them" (16). The last part of the triangle is desire which moves between the two partners. Thus, for these poets, desire is a hunter who pursues the beloved who, in turn, flees from contact (20). It is thus "eros deferred or obstructed, rather than eros triumphant, [which] is the favored subject" (21). A continuing interest in love which is painful rather than exultant is also a part of early modern erotic poetry.

2. Heather Dubrow would most probably call such a depiction a Petrarchan counter discourse. In *Echoes of Desire,* she argues that English sonneteers used "Petrarchism [as] a basso continuo against which arias in difference styles and genres are sung" (7). Since my interest is not in describing the evolution of this important poetic device, the niceties of its changing form are not a concern of my discussion.

3. In his "encyclopedic treatment" (Preussner 95) of Ovid's version of the Acteon/Diana story on subsequent writers and artists, Leonard

Barkan states that there are many versions of the myth. He also feels that Ovid's interest in a victimized Acteon makes his tale "virtually unique" (323).

4. Five miscellanies were used in this chapter. The earliest was Richard Tottel's *Songes and sonettes written by the ryght honourable Lord Henry Haward late Earle of Surrey, and other* [known popularly as Tottel's *Miscellany*] which was published in 1557. Hyder Edward Rollins calls it "one of the most important single volumes in the history of English literature" because it was the first printed anthology and because two editions were composed and published within seven weeks of the first printing (Rollins Introduction Tottel's 2:3-4). In Tottel's *Miscellany,* interest remained strong with three editions in 1557 and two in 1559 and one each in 1565, 1567, 1574, 1585 and 1587. It was republished numerous times over the next three centuries (Rollins Introduction 2:7-65). The influence of Tottel's *Miscellany* on later poets cannot be underestimated. Subsequent editions kept it before the reading and writing public. Rollins suggested that it was "largely responsible for [the] ... great outburst" (Introduction Tottel's 2:108) of Elizabethan lyricism. *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites* by Clement Robinson and "divers others" (title page) was the second anthology to be used and was published in 1584. Called "one of the most prized of the poetical gems of the Elizabethan period" (v) in an

introduction written by T. C., this work stood out from the others because each poem was "newly devised to the newest tunes that are now ... to be sung" (title page). In the foreword, "The Printer to the Reader," the printer made it clear that the combination of music and poetry is meant to appeal to female readers. The implicit assumption that there were a large enough number of female readers and simultaneously that these readers were interested in love poetry makes the volume invaluable. If *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites* stood out from the others because of its audience, *The Phoenix Nest* was a prominent anthology because of its contributors. It was composed by "the most rare and refined workes of noble men, woorthy knights, gallant gentlemen, masters of arts, and braue schollers " (title page). It was also the only miscellany to be collected and published under the supervision of a gentleman rather than a printer (Rollins Introduction *Phoenix* xvii). The target audience of the anthology was also important for it was aimed at "cultivated readers" (Rollins Introduction *Phoenix* xvii). First published in 1600 but reprinted in 1614 (MacDonald xxi), *Englands Helicon* was also an important anthology which centred on the representation of the poetic pastoral. The last anthology — *A Poetical Rhapsody Containing, Diverse Sonnets, Odes, Elegies, Madrigalls, and Other Poesies, both in Rime, and Measured Verse* [known popularly as *Davison's Poetical Rhapsody*] was published in 1602. It was reprinted three times in 1608, 1611 and 1621 (Bullen lvi) which pointed to continuing

interest. These miscellanies are useful in the project because they frequently refer to venery and because the public accepted the use of this violent pastime in love poetry. Written by often lesser known or anonymous poets over a period of more than fifty years, these short and varied poems show the prevalence of predation and domination.

5. Fifteen sequences are used in this chapter. Published over forty years, Watson's *Hekatompathia* was an early example of the genre and in it the poet was conscious of demonstrating "the style in which learned and elegant poetry should be couched" (Heninger x). This poet felt an intense sense of living up to and passing on certain traditions as described by Harold Bloom as the anxiety of influence. He, therefore, included references to hunting and/or capture to intensify his assessments of the persona's state of mind. Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella* was an influential sequence and one in which the poet made ample use of predation to describe the incompatibility of his "star lover" and "star." Constable made the hunt a prominent part of *Diana*. The sequence was divided into eight decades of often violent predation between the lover and the beloved. Barnes's *Parthenophil and Parthenophe* was a minor work but one in which the poet acknowledged that hunt metaphors remained a prominent part of the genre. Spenser's *Amoretti* was a major work which incorporated the hunt into the description of his courtship of Elizabeth

Boyle. If Spenser's reality-based account was unusual in its verisimilitude, Richard Barnfield's *Cynthia* was also unusual because of its subject matter. His sequence dealt with male/male adoration and moved equally dramatically away from the more conventional metaphoric hunting references. Griffin's *Fidessa* was a counterpoint to Barnfield because it focused on heterosexual predator-and-prey interaction. Robert Tofte produced two "radically different" (Nelson xxi) and unusual works in *Laura* and *Alba*. *Laura* was unconventional because its controlling conceit was travel and separation, and because its emphasis was on hope rather than despair (Nelson xix-xx). There would seem to be little room for the chase here but it was used. Tofte's subsequent sequence was no less unusual because its persona moved from secular anguish to divine revelation with the transition described in predatory terms. Interest in sonnets did not cease with the turn of the seventeenth century and Alexander's *Aurora* continued to show reliance on it. Two poets who cannot be said to have continued blindly in an existing sonnet tradition were William Shakespeare in his *Sonnets* and Wroth in her *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus*. Shakespeare's sequence was not addressed to a single beloved but rather used two of them: the young man and the Dark Lady. The result, as Margreta de Grazia points out, is a sequence which can be divided between Shakespeare's "pederastic love of a boy ... and gynerastic love of a womb" (46). The homoerotic nature of the young man sonnets has been discussed extensively in recent years but these sonnets differed

significantly from those in Barnfield's *Cynthia*. Shakespeare's sonnets do not focus on the male/male erotic chase but rather a fraternal and/or a paternal approach to the social demands of a young man's aristocratic heritage. The sonnets addressed to the Dark Lady are clearly heterosexual and therefore an erotic chase could be expected. One outcome of this poet's innovative approach is that there is scant use of hunting references. At least one reason for his disinterest was that the courtship had already occurred. Therefore, what is discussed is the persona's disgust with his successful conquest. If anything, the persona exhibits a (sublimated) desire to chase the Dark Lady from his life. He does not act upon this desire and instead most often rants against her. The fact that Shakespeare seems intent on producing a startlingly different sequence makes the inclusion of Cupid in his last two sonnets a surprise. Both the one hundred and fifty third and fifty fourth sonnets depart from the usual depiction of this figure as a gleeful energetic child who randomly shoots his love arrows. Instead of describing him as a hunter, Shakespeare depicts him as sleepyhead who fails to guard his flaming "brand" (153.1 and 154.2) sufficiently. These ending sonnets could be considered accidental additions for they do not address the male friend or the Dark Lady. Hallet Smith feels that they are most certainly written by Shakespeare but states that they are "translations, or adaptations, of some version of a Greek epigram" (1840). As the first English woman who wrote a sequence, Wroth

uses more hunting references than Shakespeare but not nearly as many as most other sonnet sequences writers. Wroth's sonnets are not bereft of predation but it is most often portrayed in the prey's sense of outrage and violation.

Each sequence is important because the hunt is used to describe erotic dynamics. Arlene Okerlund is one of the few critics to comment directly on the importance of hunting in this literary form. She states that the "hunter-hunted tropes of Petrarchan convention and the formality which separates pursuer from pursued doom man and woman to an inevitable and eternal separation, however idealistic their aspirations might be" (43-44). Her conclusion is that this juxtaposition between the idealistic and the realistic leads to a "poetic schizophrenia whose ideals proclaim a Platonic unity precluded by its very images" (Okerlund 44). This is an apt way of seeing difficulties outlined by the persona/lover and beloved.

6. Penetration here has a different connotation from the present day. To the modern reader, penetration is a masculine activity which culminates the "courtship" phase. Explicit sexuality in the later stage of the relationship is not present in earlier penetration examples. Instead, penetration is an early encounter with either a male (Cupid) or female (the beloved) as the perpetrator. This use was implicitly sexual but not

explicitly so. These instances were often described as penetration with a sharp instrument: Cupid's arrow and the beloved's sharp eyes. These penetrations are in keeping with concepts of early modern love psychology. Cupid's piercing of random individuals with his love arrows and the movement of "rays" from the beloved to the lover were considered a commonplace in erotic poetry. The piercing glance from the beloved is particularly interesting because it was felt that such ocular contact was not only powerful but also went directly to the heart. These commonplaces were not usually seen for what they were — metaphors of bodily aggression against a prey.

7. There has been considerable debate about the exact reasons for this enthusiasm for sonnet sequences. Arthur Marotti argues that the prevalence of sonnet sequences is politically motivated and serves as an occasion for "socially, economically and politically importunate Englishmen to express their unhappy condition in the context of a display of literary mastery ... [and i]n one sense, sonneteering [is] perceived as an activity for losers" (408). Anthony Low extends this position and sees "politics and patronage [converging] with love, and [thus] the two kinds of 'courting' are almost interchangeable" (22). These approaches take "the erotic out of the love lyric" (Hull 175) and they focus in an all-too-narrow interpretation of this powerful verse. What interests me about the

sequences is the many examples of erotic venery in them rather than the more overtly political aspects they may contain.

3.

1. History plays and in particular those by Shakespeare will not be discussed. I wish to analyze plays by a large array of playwrights and thus do not want to be restricted unduly by a focus on just one. Shakespeare's history plays — particularly a comparison of differences in predation use between the first and second tetralogies — deserve a more all-encompassing review than is possible here. I plan to undertake this project at a later date.

2. Produced over an almost fifty year period, twelve comedies with strong predation inclinations were included. William Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew* was the earliest, as it was performed first between 1588 and 1593 (Kawachi 55), and James Shirley's *The Lady of Pleasure* was the last, with a first performance in 1635. *The Taming of the Shrew's* subjugation theme made it perhaps one of the most completely hunt-related comedies. Shakespeare uses the falconer's ongoing training of a wild hawk as the central metaphor in the relationship between Petruchio and Katherina. Petruchio also refers explicitly to his wife as his "falcon" (4.1.190) which should be subject to his authority. Although the remark comes late in the play, Edward Berry thinks his moves from "training to a

lure, and, [then] climatically, the test of unrestricted flight" (101) form a subtle sub-structure. This underlying metaphor is important because it points to Shakespeare's unconventionality. Unlike his contemporaries, his focus is the taming of a predator. His reliance on falconry also helps overcome objections by feminists to the play, for Petruchio's taming of his wife is not an end in itself. Indeed, a trained predator joins the falconer in a mutual quest for prey. It is the joint venture by two "individuals" who cannot pursue their goal without each other which makes falconry an apt metaphor for marriage. Berry does, however, question whether a marriage based on an animal-human model is equal (111) and certainly the couple's relationship does not challenge the patriarchal social order. But it does show a subtlety of approach that many feminists such as Harriet Deer miss. She sees it as a dramatization of spousal abuse. As Anne Barton points out, Petruchio is less of a bully than a psychologically complex individual who manoeuvres his wife into a greater understanding of a mutual relationship (Introduction to *The Taming of the Shrew* 138). *The Lady of Pleasure* was chosen because it dealt with a young man's pursuit of a wealthy and experienced widow (which is much the same plot as Chapman's *The Widow's Tears)* and the activity is predatory.

Shakespeare's interest and knowledge of woodland settings was obvious in the earlier discussion of *Venus and Adonis* and it continued in his comedies. *The Merry Wives of Windsor* reflected most keenly the

playwright's desire to weave a convincing rural setting for his "ordinary, middle-class life in a small [English] country town" (Barton Introduction to Riverside's *The Merry Wives of Windsor* 320). This playwright's interest in verisimilitude does not stop here for the erotic chase also played a prominent role in the play. Shakespeare's desire to intertwine the actual and the erotic hunt continued in *Love's Labor's Lost* and in *As You Like It*.

Jonson used predation in *Every Man in his Humour, Volpone, Epicoene*, and *Bartholomew Fair*. *Every Man in his Humour* marks the beginning of Jonson's writing career and involves the disparagement of Stephano, or "a country gull" (folio version 9), and the foolishness of his belief that a knowledge of hawking and hunting would improve his social standing. The playwright's *Epicoene* also disparages male behaviour based on the hunt. Jonson broadens his socially critical stance in *Volpone* and in *Bartholomew Fair* by making predatory behaviour a focal point of each play. In his introduction to *Bartholomew Fair*, Arthur Kinney states that the play is "stuffed with images drawn from hunting and falconry that underlie its repeated dramatic cycles of predator and prey" (487). Jonathan Haynes thinks Jonson is restructuring the carnival into "the world of the cony-catching pamphlets" (123). I agree and indeed the play is similar to many of the works of prose fiction which will discussed in the fourth chapter. Dekker's interest in predation shows itself in *The*

Shoemakers' Holiday and *The Honest Whore*. He utilizes the actual (and the urban) hunt as well as the erotic chase.

3. G. K. Hunter's article compares *The Shoemakers' Holiday* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor* from a capitalistic perspective. Julia Gasper, however, feels his comparison is "unconvincing" (23). Since his approach focuses on the citizen and capitalistic aspects, I can see her problems with the analysis. My approach deals with the text-based predation similarities in both plays.

4. In his excellent placement of the play within an historical context, Paul S. Seaver states that the Lord Mayor's mansion is at Old Ford (97).

5. The massive influx of citizens into London caused a disruption to familially-based hierarchies of power. The city's rulers were now linked by their wealth rather than their birth (Seaver 95).

6. One of the interesting complexities in this play is that both the humans and the animals views the hunt as a "protective and nurturing action" (Berry 186). Orlando saves his brother's life (despite his desire for revenge) and the lioness attempts to kill him to save the lives of its cubs.

7. There are other explanations for Morose's behaviour. Peggy Knapp considers Morose's rejection of noise to be Jonson's comment on urban capitalism. This character represents the superiority of a self-contained and rurally-based economy. Karen Newman thinks that Morose's "early universal fear of noise is identified specifically with [a dislike of] women" (186). I prefer to see him as standing quite apart from what was considered masculine within his own time.

8. The thespian erotic hunter for the most part left behind penetration metaphors and references to Cupid but occasionally the figure creeps into these texts and in surprising places. In Jonson's play, *Volpone,* the main character discusses his love for Celia in highly poetic terms when he describes "angry Cupid, bolting from her [Celia's] eyes, / Hath shot himself into me like a flame ... and I ... Am but a heap of cinders" (2.4.3-11). This reference can be considered the somewhat antiquated sentiments of an older man but the remark does offer particular insight into the victimization he feels. As well, in Middleton and Dekker's *The Roaring Girl,* Mary reveals her unrequited love for Sebastian by harkening back to an arrow-laden Cupid. She feels that a "poisoned arrow" within her breast causes her to bleed "even to death" (1.1.28-30). An original use of the theme appears in Chapman's *The Widow's Tears.* When the panderess, Arsace, tells the widow Eudora about her suitor's prodigious sexual appetite, she states that her licentious

comments have an effect similar to when "*Cupid* [did] shoot in my words, and open his wounds in her lookes" (2.3.7). In Marlowe's *Dido,* the playwright utilizes both an ancient story and mythological characters (Venus, Cupid and Juno) to move his plot and to give it a predatory vitality. Venus first appears before Aeneas as a hunter looking for her companion. Ironically, her decision to impersonate Diana rather than herself is meant to reassure him that he is not among lusting women. Venus's true nature becomes evident when she helps to ignite Dido's passion at the end of II. In a second instance of impersonation, Venus asks Cupid to assume the shape of Aeneas's son to touch the queen's "white breast with [an] arrow head, / That she may dote upon Aeneas's love" (2.1.326-7). In the following scene (3.1), Dido talks to others and fondles Cupid/Aeneas with no knowledge of the devious plan. It is only when she begins suddenly to profess adoration for Aeneas that the audience realizes Cupid's task has been completed. Inserted into the middle of the play (3.2) is an acrimonious exchange between Juno and Venus with graphically violent images. It begins with Juno's gleeful commitment to murder Ascanius (10) as revenge for Venus's earlier thwarting of her plans against Aeneas. Venus's retort is no less violent. She wishes to tear her opponent's "eyes fro' forth thy head, / And feast the birds with their blood-shotten balls" (34-5). Undeterred, Juno states she has saved him from "snakes' and serpents' stings" (38) and that she regrets Venus's recent attempts to

thwart his journey. As a rapprochement between them, Juno manipulates the weather so that Aeneas and the Queen will be forced to take shelter in a cave and pursue the possibility of romance.

If Cupid appeared in these plays, so too did the Acteon/Diana story. In Chapman's *The Widow's Tears,* the socially inferior Tharsalio tries to woo a widowed countess. His brother attempts to caution him by alluding to Acteon and Diana but Tharsalio fails to see the similarities. To him, Acteon's downfall is his "curiosity" about Diana's "retir'd pleasures" (1.3.63-4). He feels that his more circumspect intrusion will not bring similar consequences. At the beginning of the second act, the same Ovidian story is used to dignify Tharsalio's devotion to Eudora. Despite rumours that she has shown interest in another suitor, Tharsalio feels he can accept whatever "Diana" has in store for him, including death (2.1.27-9).

One new addition to the erotic chase in these plays is the cuckold or husband. It is significant that the horns designate this individual, for indeed he is (metaphorically) the prey just as clearly as a deer is in actual predation. Shakespeare uses cuckoldry in a particularly witty way (by combining it with the Acteon/Diana story) in *The Merry Wives of Windsor.* Pistol invokes Acteon in his description of the soon-to-be cuckolded husband, Francis Ford. This Acteon has not seen Venus and therefore is not being punished by being turned into a stag. He, however,

will have the horns of a cuckold and may (at least figuratively) be pursued. After Pistol's initial analysis, Ford increasingly sees himself as a cuckold until in 3.3 (the Falstaff-in-the-washing scene) his repetition of the word "buck" has a personal double meaning. A buck is a short form for buck or clothes washing but the more personal meaning is getting rid of horns (footnote *Riverside* 342). Another example of Shakespeare's use of the word is when Touchstone equates (deer) horns with cuckoldry (*As You Like It* 3.3). His comic use reminds the audience of complexities of a three-way erotic chase with a pursuer, pursued and the superfluous second man.

9. At least one critic praises Hammon's rhetorical skill at mimicking the leisured world of the pastoral romance (Seaver 97) but my view is that he is more a participant than initiator of the exchange. His competence cannot be questioned but it is Rose who leads while Hammon follows.

10. There is another interpretation. Edward Berry thinks that Shakespeare's anthropomorphic treatment of the dying deer places the hind at odds with his contemporaries. He considers the playwright's juxtaposition as creating a paradoxical situation with the hunt being simultaneously harmonious and discordant with nature (172).

11. R. B. Parker points out that animal symbolism was "almost a habit of mind" (5) during the Renaissance and thus Jonson's title choice was not random. Medieval bestiaries speak of the fox as an animal which simulates its own death in order to obtain food (Faber 13) and thus Volpone's antics would not come as a surprise to Jonson's audience. Mosca's identification as a fly implies the capacity to feed off a variety of hosts and thus his relationship with Volpone can be seen as highly unstable (DiGangi 188).

12. Produced over a twenty year period, ten predation-rich tragedies were included. The earliest — Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* — was initially performed between 1592 and 1599 (Arthur Kinney Intro to *The Spanish Tragedy* 48). It was Kyd's earliest tragedy and the playwright exhibited an unusual perspective on the predatory aspects of revenge. Just outside of the play's boundaries, a character named Revenge sits with the maligned Don Andrea while revenge plots appear in the inset play. As well, explicit predation is at its centre with a lengthy list of dead read out by the Ghost at the end of the play:

> "Horatio murdered in his father's bower, / Wild Serberine by Pedringano slain, / False Pedringano hanged by quaint device, / Fair Isabella by herself misdone, / Prince Balthazar by Bel-imperia stabbed, The duke of Castile and his wicked son /

> Both done to death by old Hieronomo, / My Bel-imperia
> fall'n as Dido fell, / And good Hieronimo slain by himself"
>
> 4.5.2-11

Rather than clustering these pursuits around images of domineering animals or put-upon humans, Kyd lets predation — as a move of domination and a countermove of revenge — carry the plot forward. John Webster's *The White Devil* was chronologically the last predatory tragedy to be considered. As Christina Luckyj points out in her introduction to this play, it is a revenge tragedy "which pits revengers against their villainous enemies" but those revengers are "deeply implicated in the corrupt world around them" (xiv). There is little sense that a better world will ensue after revenge has been accomplished and thus *The White Devil's* unrelenting predation makes it a valuable addition to the project.

Marlowe intertwined a predatory theme into two of his tragedies: *Tamburlaine* and *The Massacre at Paris*. In *Tamburlaine,* he used explicit predatory and prey references to define long-standing conflicts among the characters. One of the few critics to notice this aspect of the play is Michael Goldman but he calls it ravishment and defines his term as the arousal "by a single source to the possibility of entire bliss" and as the "passionate attachment to particular aims" (22). Goldman thinks heroes present themselves as ravished by a particular object (in Tamburlaine's

case, a crown) which is later discarded as "trash" (23). His analysis is valid up to a point because he understands the obsessively goal-oriented characters and the ultimate dissatisfaction with winning. He neglects the predatory textual references which serve to substantiate my argument. Domination dynamics continued to interest Marlowe in *Massacre at Paris* where he simultaneously explored the tyrannous behaviour of the Duke of Guise towards Protestants and attempts to thwart them. Like Marlowe, Shakespeare also used predation in his tragedies: *Macbeth, Hamlet, Titus Andronicus* and *Julius Caesar*. *Macbeth* is a blood-drenched play but one which strangely contains few hunt references. The surprise diminishes when the plot's reliance on oracular prophets — the witches — is considered. Unlike the other social climbing murderers or revengers, Macbeth's exploits are not his own but "dictated" to him by supernatural beings. He could ignore their meddling with his life but he does not. What is different about Shakespeare's use of other worldly intervention is that there was little need for sketching in deep-seeded jealousy or competition between the murderer and the murdered. The whole bloody episode is orchestrated by others. *Hamlet* has few predation references, despite being a play about revenge. One of the easily overlooked predatory references is the title of the play within a play: "The Mousetrap." The title is a double predatory allusion because Hamlet means to track his stepfather's reaction to the plot in order to trap himself,

and it also provides a glimpse into the prince's view of his stepfather as a self-elevated mouse caught in a trap. The early and horrific *Titus Andronicus* has plenty of violence which is often presented as predation. Its unrelenting theme has led to a critical unwillingness to attribute the play to Shakespeare (Kermode 1065). But it is clear it has much in common with other hunt references in his works. *Julius Caesar* is also about predation, with its victim clearly marked by the title. Much of the plot up until the killing can be seen as the pursuit of that prey. Jonson also explores Roman power struggles in *Sejanus, his Fall.* The anonymous *Arden of Faversham* follows a more straightforward design. Richard Helgerson sees it as a "murder play, ... [a] crime pamphlet, and ... [a] collection of wonders" (137) but its framework is straightforward. All the characters — except Thomas Arden— focus on murder or the hunting down of prey.

13. Any work that focuses on murder of a prominent individual seems, in the broadest sense, to be a tragedy rather than comedy. My reliance on this assumption was shaken after seeing a spirited production by the University of Alberta's Nice Wantons in April 2002. The company's focus on inept predation moves the play from serious to burlesque. *Arden of Faversham,* however, remains a stylized work built largely on a solid foundation of unusual predation references.

14. Catherine Belsey asserts that the play feeds on the "widespread belief" that wives are likely to murder their husbands (138). Michael Neill also argues that it fits in a broader context of "destablization of traditional hierarchies ... [that results in] unfettered play of individual desire" (67).

15. Tamberlaine's depiction by his enemies moves away from predatory terms but continues to be intensely negative. In 2.6 of One, he is called a presumptive and "devlish shepherd" (1), a "monstrous slave" (7) "never sprung of human race" (11), a "god or fiend or spirit of the earth, / Or monster turned into a manly shape" (15-6), a "grievous image of ingratitude, / And a ... fiery thirster after sovereignty" (30-1). By 3.1, the King of Morocco has extended Tamburlaine's undesirable qualities to include meteorological changes. He thinks Tamburlaine is hindering spring for "neither rain can fall upon on earth / Nor sun reflex his virtuous beams" (50-1).

16. Mark Thornton Burnett thinks that the paradox of the play lies in Tamburlaine's inescapable low birth. It is his origins which reassert themselves in the second play (36).

4.

1. Constance Relihan comments that twentieth century histories of English prose fiction dismiss the period very quickly (Introduction 2). Dorothy Van Ghent's *The English Novel: Form and Function,* for example, begins with *Don Quixote* and then plunges into eighteenth century works. A far more perceptive analyst of the period is Ernest A. Baker for he acknowledges the literary period by stating that it is "a most fruitful and decisive era in the history of the novel" (1:297).

2. Nine romantic quest works were included. They ranged chronologically from the complex and spirited tale — "A Discourse of the Adventures Passed by Master F. J." — by George Gascoigne published in 1573 to the much shorter incestuous tale — "Don Juan and Marsillia" — by the almost forgotten Essex merchant John Reynolds in 1635. Paul Salzman feels that Gascoigne's "A Discourse of the Adventures Passed by Master F. J." is one of the "most sophisticated" (xii) Elizabethan works because it has multiple narrators and because it scrutinizes the code of courtly love. "Don Juan and Marsillia" was the sixteenth of a thirty story work, *The Triumphs of God's Revenge.* According to Charles Mish, the larger work is "one of the most popular collections of stories in its age" (Mish

Introduction to "Don Juan and Marsillia" 195) and remained so until well into the eighteenth century. Charles Mish feels the tale is an oddity because it imitates the tragic tales published much earlier in the 1570s and 1580s. He may be correct but this fact also points to the continuing popularity of predatory plots. George Pettie's short stories in *A Pettie Pallace* was first published in 1576 with a sixth and possibly seventh edition in 1613 (Hartman Introduction xiii). It provides ample examples of literary predation. The unswerving focus of the short stories in Pettie's *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites* is on the predatory and inherently dangerous qualities of love. Robert Greene is a major figure in the predation literature discussed in this chapter. His two romances, *Pandosto* and *Menaphon,* are important additions to the analysis. The date of the surviving edition of *Pandosto* was 1588 but Lori Humphrey Newcomb (and Paul Salzman) thinks it was published earlier in approximately 1585. The date of first publication may be difficult to ascertain but there can be little doubt about its popularity. There were sixteen editions before 1660, at least twenty-five after the Restoration, and later undated versions between 1795 and 1820 (Newcomb 120). By 1634, *Menaphon* had run to six editions (Cantar footnote 34). In both cases, Greene uses erotic hunters but to differing degrees. In the first, a series of erotic predators move the action while in the second the focus is on one individual and his jealousy. Using much the same model as Greene's

Menaphon, Lodge creates a story of serial predation in *A Margarite of America* and also in *Rosalind*. The latter book was first printed in 1590 and remained popular with nine editions between 1592 and 1634 (*English Short Title Catalogue)*. Clare Kinney calls it "a best-seller of the 1590s" (292). Sidney's *The Old Arcadia* is a pastoral work but the writer does not populate his text with only shepherds. Using a single actual hunt episode but ongoing erotic predation, Sidney makes ample use of hunting in his exploration of the interaction between aristocrats and shepherds. As the first full-length work of fiction by an English woman (Roberts and Hannay 145), Mary Wroth's *Urania* is a vast and sprawling romance about aristocrats who live an outdoor life which involves pursuit of animals and each other. Predation is such a constant in the work that it gives the diverse plot a degree of cohesion. Unlike Sidney who uses the rural hunt sparingly for characterization early in his work, Wroth's interest does not flag; she incorporates it throughout *Urania*.

These works were chosen because predation was prevalent within them and because they had numerous editions. There are four works which are exceptions. Thomas Lodge's *Margarite of America* was printed only once in 1596 (*English Short Title Catalogue)* but is included because it is an example of serial human predation. Wroth's *Urania* was printed only once in 1621 and subsequently withdrawn. It proved controversial because certain aristocrats complained that their lives were portrayed.

Writing to James I's favourite, George Villiers, first duke of Buckingham, Wroth declared her innocence of any wrongdoing but added that she had stopped its sale (Josephine Roberts Textual cv). She did not revise it nor publish further installments. Despite the single edition, the work is included because it is a double rarity: it is produced by a woman and it is unusually long and complex. Somewhat different concerns arise with both Gascoigne's "A Discourse of the Adventures Passed by Master F. J." and Sidney's *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (The Old Arcadia).* Gascoigne's predation-laden work "offended important people in the court (who perceived it as slanderous) and in the church (who deplored it as immoral)" (Bloomfield 163). Gillian Austen offers a slightly different explanation when she states that the author's "assurances that the story was not based on actual events convinced no-one" (Hir Acustomed 12). As a result of these objections, Gascoigne re-presented the tale as a translation of an Italian work which was "tamed and moralized" (Eriksen 187). I have chosen to analyze the earlier publication because it is Gascoigne's highly original work before he succumbed to censorship. Fortunately, I am supported in this decision because "almost everyone who has expressed an opinion [preferred] the first to the second edition" (Pigman Commentary 552). Sidney's work also had a complex publication history. He rewrote much of his original unpublished work (*The Old Acadia)* before his death but did not finish it. *Arcadia* (1590) was

finished by others and thus it had the "profound disadvantage of being only half written, breaking off in mid-sentence with a huge amount of unfinished business" (Duncan-Jones Introduction viii). This version was extremely popular with a fourth reprint issued in 1599 (Morgan 15). The earlier work, *The Old Arcadia,* was meant to be "read aloud in the intimate company" of Sidney's sister and her friends (Margolies 66) and was not published as an intact work until the twentieth century. Sidney may have wished a more convoluted and considerably less effective work to be his legacy but it is *The Old Arcadia* which stands and should stand as his romantic vision.

3. Gascoigne recesses "a framework of letters from H.W., ostensibly the publisher, and G. T., ostensibly the editor" (Gillian Austen Gascoigne's *Master FJ* 68) into the narrative. The result is a seemingly autobiographical tale with a critical "spectator." The introduction of this "Trollopian busybody" (Bloomfield 169) shifts the narrative from personally to critically subjective and does little to improve reader enjoyment. The approach is important to a discussion of predation because it is G. T. who critiques the main character's action using hunting metaphors.

4. Katherine Roberts (indirectly) proposes quite a different reading of the scene. She feels any interaction with women is deliberately negative

because there were only two functions for women in the plot: to provide the two main characters with love objects [or to act as] obstacles in the path of heroic endeavor which causes the heroes to become hopelessly inactive and even effeminate" (*Fair Ladies* 29). Since the erotic aspects of the work are an important part of my analysis, I do not agree that the beloveds must necessarily be seen as negative.

5. It can be easily argued that all unwanted attentions by an erotically aggressive "suitor" are subliminally if not blatantly violent. One aspect of this kind of hunt which is of particular interest to Greene is the incestuous pursuit of a daughter by a father. *Menaphon* and *Pandosto* both end with an older man's pursuit of a much younger woman who turns out to be his own flesh and blood. Brenda Cantar sees interest in the theme as fictional representations of debates over the control of daughters and the resulting anxiety over the issue (23).

6. Josephine Roberts points out that this hunter is unusual because she is "more then woman-like excellent in riding" (182.31; Commentary 738-9). During the time, courtesy books "rarely mention[ed] physical activity for women" (Josephine Roberts Commentary 182.31, 738-9).

7. Arguing that the short story most closely resembles tragical tales

published in the 1570s and 1580s, Charles Mish feels that it is an anachronism (Introduction to "Don Juan and Marsillia" 196). He may well be correct that it is an oddity but I include it here because its author shows considerable interest in the erotic pursuit.

8. Fourteen picaresque pursuit works were analyzed. Published over five decades, these works illustrated the public's appetite for rogue tales. They ranged from the early urban predation pamphlet — *The Notable Discovery of Coosnage* and four others on the same subject — by Robert Greene and published in 1591-2, to the anonymous animal fable —*The Pleasant History of Cawwood the Rooke* — published in 1640. Greene is a good early example because he produced five pamphlets in quick succession in the months before his sudden death. A sign of the popularity of his pamphlet lies in the fact that Greene continued to publish them and did not move to more lucrative topics. The individual pamphlets were also popular: *The Notable Discovery of Coosnage* had three 1591 editions and one in 1592; *The Second Part of Conny Catching* had one 1591 edition and one in 1592; and *The Defence of Conny Catching* had two 1592 editions (*The English Short Title Catalogue*). The reading public continued to show interest in the genre. Even after five decades, the anonymous rogue animal fable, Cawwood the Rook, had four editions in 1640, 1656, 1683, and an undated publication most probably in 1700 (*The*

English Short Title Catalogue). In the early eighteenth century, the story was attached to Reynard the Fox in at least six editions (Mish Introduction to "Cawwood the Rook" 342). No less popular were the works published between Greene's pamphlets and the animal fable. Paul Salzman states that *Jack of Newbury* is one of the "best-selling books through the seventeenth century" (Introduction xxiii). There were two 1594 editions of *The Unfortunate Traveller*, with the possibility of an earlier edition since "newly corrected and augmented" was printed on the title page of the shorter version. "The Miseries of Mavillia" appeared in the 1597, 1599 and 1606 editions of Breton's *Wil or Wit, Wits Will, or Wills Wit, Chuse You Whether*. Dekker's *The Belman of London* was also popular with three impressions in 1608 with a fourth and a fifth in 1616 and 1640 (*The English Short Title Catalogue)*. Even the anonymous *The Tinker of Turvey* published in 1630 must be considered popular since it was a reissue of the 1590 *The Cobbler of Canterbury* (Mish Introduction to "The Tinker of Turvey" 118).

A prodigious publication history was one criteria for inclusion but there was another. Each work was chosen for the predatory characteristics incorporated by its author into the tale. One factor which set these works apart from other genres was the autobiographical component. They often purport to be "true accounts of actual occurrences" in an "ugly and unclean" reality (Baker 126, 129). An inkling of the range of approaches

within these parameters can be seen in the two works which serve as chronological bookends: Greene's cony-catching pamphlets and the anonymous animal fable, *The Pleasant History of Cawwood the Rooke.* As the first professional writer in England (Margolies 105), Greene saw financial gain as the prime incentive to writing about the urban hunting of the London underworld. What began as a publication with a first and second part (Margolies 106) grew to five pamphlets within a short time. Standing between the prose news model (envisioned by Lennard Davis as an early form of newspaper) and a form of autobiographical anecdotes, Greene set out to inform his readers about human predators and the dangers they produced. Indeed, Constance C. Relihan goes further by arguing that his crossing of the boundaries between fact and fiction places Greene in the category of social critic (*Narrative Strategies* 13). Published four decades later, *The Pleasant History of Cawwood the Rooke* offered a dissimilar narrative on a similar theme. Far from uncovering the skulduggery in human society, the anonymous writer used the more indirect approach of an animal fable to discuss aggression within society.

Using neither the muckraking nor fable approach, Nashe shaped his fictional autobiography through predatory situations in *The Unfortunate Traveller*. Susan Marie Harrington and Michal Nahor Bond are critics who feel that the work is about the "pleasure in domination" (244). They argue that Jack Wilton, at first, enjoys manipulating and controlling others

(244-5) but loses this superior position the further he wanders away from England. Simone Dorangeon also comments on this aspect, seeing Wilton's "fallacy of ultimate domination" (262) disintegrate once he arrives in Italy. James Keller thinks the movement is deliberate on Nashe's part so that Wilton will eventually embrace his native customs. The main character in Deloney's *Jack of Newbury* did not leave the British island for his own adventures in economic aggrandizement. David Margolies calls the author a "bourgeois propagandist" (144) and indeed Jack Wilton serves as an inspiration to status-seeking non-aristocratic readers. Not all fictional autobiographies offered a positive trajectory. Breton's *The Miseries of Mavillia* revealed an ongoing tale of a predation-prone character. Dekker's *The Belman of London* and *English Villanies discovered by Lantern and Candlelight* followed Greene's rural to urban hunting model and made its danger more explicit. The final work, *The Tinker of Turvey,* focused on urban and erotic predation through tales told by an assortment of narrators.

9. Just as those who created romance pursuits warned readers of the pitfalls of love, the writers of these tales also had a didactic agenda. They wished to prevent their readers from unwittingly succumbing to the harm done by thieves and vagabonds. This agenda by both romance and picaresque prose writers is not discussed here because what is relevant to

the project is their predatory vision.

10. In *Crimes and Mentalities in Early Modern England,* Malcolm Gaskill underlines this view when he points to the social changes in the sixteenth century. With population growth and changes in land use, the relationships between high and low classes shifted from "custom and oral tradition" in the country to the "wage-nexus and the market" (13) in the city.

11. Greene was not the first early modern writer to delve into this nefarious world. In *Rogues, Vagabonds and Sturdy Beggars,* Arthur Kinney showcases earlier works such as Gilbert Walker's *A Manifest Detection of Diceplay* (1552), John Awdeley's *The Fraternity of Vagabonds* (1561), and Thomas Harman's *A Caveat for Common Cursitors Vulgarly Called Vagabonds* (1566). Since my objective is not to write the complete work on this form of predation, I focus on only two authors (Greene and Dekker) who also wrote plays and poetry.

12. In medieval and early modern usage, a cony was a mature animal, with juveniles being referred to as rabbits (Manning 25).

13. The author listed on the title page of the pamphlet was

"Cuthbert Cunny-catcher." Alexander Grosart does not think he is Greene. In a note just before the text, the editor of Greene's works states that the derogatory comments against Greene disqualify it as his publication. Ernest Baker provides evidence of the author's sense of playfulness which makes him sure that Greene is the author of both publications. According to him, both *A Notable Discovery* and *The Second and Last Part of Conny-catching* were published simultaneously in December 1591 (1:135) but their author alleged (in the second publication) that his enemies were already badly hit by his muckraking writing. Greene's creative or dramatic alteration of facts makes a *nom de plume* possible. Most critics accept that these two individuals are one and the same, and so do I.

14. Most of the predation in these stories is erotic and thus this aspect will be discussed in the forthcoming section.

15. The prostitutes in Greene's narratives are usually stock figures but he includes a "more thoroughly individualized character" (Woods 117) in the last part of *A Disputation*. The subject is unnamed in "The Conversion of an English Courtizan," but it can be safely assumed that she is Nan. The story she "tells" is self-justifying: she blames her wanton ways on her parents who indulged her. A surprising element in this autobiography is the number of predatory allusions. The narrator speaks

of herself repeatedly as a beautiful hawk (239, 241) who commands and preys upon all she surveys.

16. Greene defines cross-biting as "a publique profession of shameless cosenage, mixt with incestuous whoredomes" (*Notable* 39): a prostitute picks up a customer and when she has him safely in bed, her male accomplice (the cross-biter) bursts in and accuses the man of seducing his wife or sister. The customer, fearing for his life and reputation, gladly pays off the cross-biter in exchange for his silence.

17. Constance C. Relihan states that, with the exception of Diamante, all the female characters in *The Unfortunate Traveller* expose Wilton to imprisonment or possible execution (Rhetoric 147).

18. Ernest Baker feels that Deloney's linking of Wilton's history with "events that everyone could give a date to, from the siege of Tourney at the beginning to the Field of the Cloth of gold at the end" serves as a signal to the reader that the work is "something like fact" (1:160-1).

Bibliography

Abrams, M. H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 4th ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1981.

Adams, Carol J. *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory*. New York: Continuum, 1990.

Ainsworth, William Harrison. *The Lancashire Witches: A Romance of Pendle Forest*. London: George Routledge, [n.d.]

Aldis, H. G. and Robert Bowes. *A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of Foreign Printers of English Books 1557-1640*. [Oxford]: The Bibliographical Society, 1968.

Alexander, William. "Aurora Containing the first fancies of the Authors Youth." *English and Scottish Sonnet Sequences of the Renaissance*. Ed. Holger M. Klein. 2 vols. Hildesheim, New York: Georg Olmes, 1984. 1:285-377.

Amor, Anne Clark. *Beasts and Bawdy*. London: J. M. Dent, 1975.

Anderson, Patricia. *When Passion Reigned: Sex and the Victorians*. New York: Basic Books, 1995.

Arden of Faversham. *Renaissance Drama: An Anthology of Plays and Entertainments*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Malden, Mass: Blackwell, 1999. 101-37.

Assheton, Nicholas. *The Journal of Nicholas Assheton, of Downham, in the Country of Lancaster, Esq., for Part of the year 1617, and following*. Ed. F. R. Raines. Chetham Society, 1848. New York, London: Johnson Reprint 1968.

Austen, Gillian. " 'Hir Acustomed Change:' In Defence of Gascoigne's Elinor." *Imaginaires* 2 (1997): 9-30.

A. W. "An Invective against Love." *Davison's Poetical Rhapsody*. Ed. A. H. Bullen. 2 vols. London: George Bell and Sons, 1890-91. 2:59-60.

--. "Cupid Shoots Light, but Wounds Sore." *Davison's Poetical Rhapsody*. Ed. A. H. Bullen. 2 vols. London: George Bell and Sons, 1890-91. 2:54-5.

Bacon, Francis. *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*. Ed. James Spedding. 7 vols. London: Longman, Green, Longman and Roberts, 1861-74.

Baker, Ernest A. *The History of the English Novel*. 10 vols. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1963-4.

Baldwin, T. W. *William Shakespere's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke*. 2 vols. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1944.

Barkan, Leonard. "Diana and Actaeon: The Myth as Synthesis." *English Literary Renaissance* 10 (1980): 317-59.

Barnes, Barnabe. *Parthenophil and Parthenophe: A Critical Edition*. Ed. Victor A. Doyno. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1971.

Barnfield, Richard. "Cynthia." *English and Scottish Sonnet Sequences of the Renaissance*. Ed. Holger M. Klein. 2 vols. Hildesheim, New York: Georg Olmes, 1984. 1:191-224.

Barton, Anne. *Ben Jonson, dramatist*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge UP, 1984.

--. Introduction to *As You Like It*. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997. 399-402.

--. Introduction to *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997. 320-3.

--. Introduction to *The Taming of the Shrew*. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997. 138-41.

Bate, Jonathan. "Sexual Perversity in *Venus and Adonis*." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 23 (1993): 80-92.

Belsey, Catherine. "Alice Arden's Crime: Arden of Faversham (c. 1590)." *Staging the Renaissance: Reinterpretations of Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama*. Ed. David Scott Kastan and Peter Stallybrass. New York: Routledge, 1991. 133-50.

--. "Love as Trompe-l'Oeil: Taxonomies of Desire in *Venus and Adonis*." Venus and Adonis: *Critical Essays*. Ed. Philip C. Kolin. New York: Garland, 1997. 261-85.

Berners, Juliana. *English Hawking and Hunting in The Boke of St. Albans*. London: Oxford UP, 1975.

Berry, Edward. *Shakespeare and the Hunt: A Cultural and Social Study*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge UP, 2001.

Best, Michael. "Introduction." *The English Housewife*. By Gervase Markham. Ed. Michael R. Best. Kingston: McGill-Queen's UP, 1986. xi-lviii.

Bevan, Bryan. *King James VI of Scotland and I of England*. London: Rubicon P, 1996.

Billett, Michael. *A History of English Country Sports*. London: Robert Hale, 1994.

Black, Max. "More about metaphor." *Metaphor and Thought*. 2nd ed. Ed. Andrew Ortony. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge UP, 1993. 19-41.

Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. New York: Oxford UP, 1975.

Bloomfield, Josephine. 'Gascoigne's *Master F.J.* as a Renaissance Pro-Novel: The Birth of the Judicious Editor as Narrator." *Essays in Literature* 19 (1992): 163-72.

Bohde, Cheryl D. " 'On Being Hunted': Love as Game in *Clarissa*." *Conference of College Teachers of English Studies* 50 (1985): 45-50.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Trans. Richard Nice. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard UP, 1984.

Bowers, A. Robin. " 'Hard Armours' and 'Delicate Amours' in Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*." *Shakespeare Studies* 12 (1979): 1-23.

Breton, Nicholas. "The Miseries of Mavillia." *The Works in Verse and Prose of Nicholas Breton*. 2 vols. Ed. Alexander B. Grosart. 1879. New York: AMS Press, 1966. 2:33-51.

Brusewitz, Gunnar. *Hunting: Hunters, Game, Weapons and Hunting Methods from the Remote Past to the Present Day*. New York: Stein and Day, 1969.

Bullen, A. H. Introduction. *Davison's Poetical Rhapsody*. Ed. A. H. Bullen. 2 vols. London: George Bell and Sons, 1890. 1:ix-lxxxvii.

Burnett, Mark Thornton. "*Tamburlaine* and the Body." *Criticism* 33 (1991): 31-47.

Calendar of New Forest Documents: The Fifteenth to the Seventeenth Centuries. Ed. D. J. Stagg. [Winchester]: Hampshire Record Office for Hampshire Country Council, 1983.

Cantar, Brenda. " 'Silenced But For The Word': The Discourse of Incest in Greene's *Pandosto and Menaphon*. *English Studies in Canada* 23 (1997): 21-36.

Carlton, Charles. *Charles I: the Personal Monarch*. London, Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983.

Carr, Raymond. *English Fox Hunting: A History*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1976.

Carson, Anne. *Eros the Bittersweet: An Essay*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1986.

Cartmill, Matt. *A View to a Death in the Morning: Hunting and Nature Through History*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1993.

Cavendish, Margaret. "The Hunting of the Hare." *Poems and Fancies 1653*. Menston: Scolar P, 1972. 110-2.

Chamberlain, John. *The Chamberlain Letters: A Selection of the Letters of John Chamberlain Concerning Life in England from 1597 to 1626*. Ed. Elizabeth McClure Thomson. London: John Murray, 1966.

Chapman, George. "The Widow's Tears." Ed. Robert Ornstein. *The Plays of George Chapman: The Comedies: A Critical Edition*. Ed. Allan Holaday and Michael Kiernan. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1970. 477-544.

Cleland, James. *The Institution of A Young Noble Man*. New York: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1948.

Cliffe, J. T. *The World of the Country House in Seventeenth Century England*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1999.

Cockaine, Thomas. See Cockayne, Thomas.

Cockayne, Thomas. *A Short Treatise of Hunting 1591*. Imprinted at London by Thomas Orwin for Thomas Woodcock, dwelling in Paules Churchyard at the sign of the black Beare, 1591. Published for the Shakespeare Association by Humphrey Milford. [Oxford]: Oxford UP, 1932.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. "Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*." Venus and Adonis: *Critical Essays*. Ed. Philip C. Kolin. New York: Garland, 1997. 69-72.

Constable, Henry. "Diana." *Elizabethan Sonnet-Cycles*. Ed. Martha Foote Crow. 4 vols. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1896. 2:93-173.

Crocker, J. Christopher. "The Social Functions of Rhetorical Forms." *The Social Use of Metaphor: Essays on the Anthropology of Rhetoric*. Ed. J. David Sapir and J. Christopher Crocker. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1977. 33-66.

Daniel, Samuel. "Delia." [1623 edition]. *Elizabethan Sonnet-Cycles*. Ed. Martha Foote Crow. 4 vols. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1896. 2:15-79.

Davis, Lennard J. *Factual Fictions: The Origins of the English Novel*. New York: Columbia UP, 1983.

Davison, Francis. "Answer to Her Question, what love was." *Davison's Poetical Rhapsody*. Ed. A. H. Bullen. 2 vols. London: George Bell and Sons, 1890.

1:129.

--. "Cupid Proved a Fencer." *Davison's Poetical Rhapsody*. Ed. A. H. Bullen. 2 vols. London: George Bell and Sons, 1890. 1:127.

Davison, Francis, comp. *A Poetical Rhapsody Containing, Diverse Sonnets, Odes, Elegies, Madrigalls, and Other Poesies, both in Rime , and Measured Verse*. Ed. A. H. Bullen. London: George Bell and Sons, 1890-1. See *Davison's Poetical Rhapsody*.

Davison's Poetical Rhapsody. Ed. A. H. Bullen. 2 vols. London: George Bell and Sons, 1890-1.

Deer, Harriet A. "Untyping Stereotypes: *The Taming of the Shrew*." *The Aching Hearth: Family Violence in Life and Literature*. Eds. Sara Munson Deats and Lagretta Tallent Lenker. New York: Plenum Press, 1991. 63-78.

De Grazia, Margreta. "The Scandal of Shakespeare's Sonnets." *Shakespeare Survey* 46 (1993): 35-49.

Dekker, Thomas. "The Belman of London." *The Non-Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*. Ed. Alexander B. Grosart. 5 vols. 1884. New York: Russell & Russell, 1963. 3:61-169.

--. "English Villainies Discovered by Lantern and Candlelight." *Thomas Dekker:* The Wonderful Year; The Gull's Horn-Book; Penny-Wise, Pound Foolish; English Villainies Discovered by Lantern and Candlelight

and Selected Writings by Thomas Dekker. Ed. E. D. Pendry. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1968. 169-282.

--. *The Honest Whore (Part One with Thomas Middleton).* Ed. Nick de Somogyi. London: Globe Education in association with Nick Hern Books, 1998.

--. "The Shoemakers' Holiday." *Renaissance Drama: An Anthology of Plays and Entertainments.* Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 1999. 249-86.

Deloney, Thomas. "Jack of Newbury." *An Anthology of Elizabethan Prose Fiction.* Ed. Paul Salzman. Oxford, New York: Oxford UP, 1987. 311-92.

Dickens, Charles. *Oliver Twist.* Ed. Kathleen Tillotson. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999.

Dietler, Michael. "Feasts and Commensal Politics in the Political Economy: Food Power and Status in Prehistoric Europe." *Food and the Status Quest: An Interdisciplinary Perspective.* Ed. Polly Wiessner and Wulf Schiefenhövel. Providence: Berghahn Books, 1996. 87-125.

DiGangi, Mario. "Asses and Wits: The Homoerotics of Mastery in Satiric Comedy." *English Literary Renaissance* 25 (1995): 179-208.

Dollimore, Jonathan. *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1984.

Dorangeon, Simone. "Nashe's *Unfortunate Traveller*, Or Absence of Narrative Consistency Disguised as Wit." *Narrative Strategies in Early English Fiction*. Ed. Wolfgang Görtschacher and Holger Klein. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen P, 1995. 259-72.

Douglas, Mary. "The pangolin revisited: a new approach to animal symbolism." *Signifying Animals: Human Meaning in the Natural World*. Ed. Rob Willis. London, Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1990. 25-36.

Dubrow, Heather. *Echoes of Desire: English Petrarchism and Its Counterdiscourses*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995.

--. *Genre*. London, New York: Methuen, 1982.

Duff, David. Introduction. *Modern Genre Theory*. Ed. David Duff. Harlow, England and New York: Longman, 2000. 1-24.

Duffy, Maureen. "Beasts of Pleasure." *Animals, Men and Morals: An Enquiry into the Maltreatment of Non-Humans*. Ed. Stanley and Rosalind Godlovitch, and John Harris. New York: Taplinger, 1972. 111-24.

Duncan-Jones, Katherine. "Introduction." *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (The Old Arcadia)*. By Philip Sidney. 2nd ed. Ed. Katherine Duncan Jones. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1985. vii-xvi.

Eisenstein, Elizabeth L. *The Printing Press as An Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early Modern Europe*. 2 vols. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge UP, 1979.

Elizabeth I. "Elizabeth to James, January-February 1587." *Elizabeth 1: Collected Works*. Ed. Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2000. 293-4.

--. "On Monsieur's Departure." *Elizabeth 1: Collected Works*. Ed. Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2000. 302-3.

Elyot, Thomas. *The Book Named the Governor*.2nd ed. 1531. *Early English Books Online*. 25 July 2003 <http://www.lib.umi.com/eebo>

Englands Helicon, edited from the edition of 1600 with additional poems from the edition of 1614. Ed. Hugh Macdonald. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1949.

The English Short Title Catalogue 1473-1800. CD-ROM. London: British Library, 1998.

Eriksen, Roy. "The mimesis of change: Gascoigne's *Adventures of Master F.J.* (1573)." *Contexts of Pre-Novel Narrative: The European Tradition*. Ed. Roy Eriksen. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1994. 185-228.

Evers, Alma. "Some Blest Champain: Hardy on Hunting." *The Thomas Hardy Year Book* 14 (1987): 18-9.

Faber, Annemarie. *Contemporary Life and Manner in Ben Jonson's Comedies*. Salzburg: Institut für Anglislik und Amerikanistik, Universität

Salzburg, 1985.

Fletcher, Anthony. *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1995.

Fletcher, Giles. "From *Licia* [*or Poemes of Love*]." *Elizabethan Sonnets.* Ed. Maurice Evans. London: J. M. Dent, 1977. 166-70.

Fraser, Antonia. *Cromwell: The Lord Protector.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1974.

Gascoigne, George. "A Discourse of the Adventures Passed by Master F.J." *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres.* Ed. G. W. Pigman III. Oxford: Clarendon P; New York: Oxford UP, 2000. 141-216.

--. "A primer of English poetry (1575)." *English Renaissance Literary Criticism.* Ed. Brian Vickers. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1999. 162-71.

--. "My worthy Lord, I pray you wonder not." *A Hundredth Sundrie Flowres.* By George Gascoigne. Ed. G.W. Pigman III. Oxford: Clarendon P, 2000. 312-16.

--. *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting.* Oxford: Clarendon P, 1908.

Gaskill, Malcolm. *Crimes and Mentalities in Early Modern England.* Cambridge, New York: Cambridge UP, 2000.

Gasper, Julia. *The Dragon and The Dove: The Plays of Thomas Dekker.*

Oxford: Clarendon P; New York: Oxford UP, 1990.

Geertz, Clifford. "Blurred Genres: The Refiguration of Social Thought." *Critical Theory Since 1965*. Ed. Hazard Adams and Leroy Searle. Tallahassee: Florida State UP, 1968. 514-23.

The Geneva Bible: a facsimile of the 1560 edition. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1969.

Girouard, Mark. *Life in the English Country House: A Social and Architectural History*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1978.

Goldman, Michael. "Marlowe and the Histrionics of Ravishment." *Renaissance Mythmakers: Christopher Marlowe and Ben Jonson*. Selected Papers from the English Institute, 1975-76. New Series No. 1. Ed. Alvin Kernan. Baltimore, Md.; London: John Hopkins UP, 1977. 22-40.

Green, Henry. "Index to the Mottoes with Translations; and some Proverbial Expressions." *A Choice of Emblemes, and Other Devises* By Geffrey Whitney. Leyden: Francis Raphelengius, 1586. Rpt. *Whitney's "Choice of Emblemes:" A Fac-simile Reprint*. London: Lovell Reeve; Chester: Minshull & Hughes; and Nantwich: E. F. Griffiths,1866. Rpt. *Geffrey Whitney: A Choice of Emblemes*. Edited by Henry Green (1866). Hildesheim, New York: Georg Olms, 1971. lxxv-lxxx.

Greene, Robert. "The Defence of Conny catching." *The Life and Complete Works in Prose and Verse of Robert Greene*. 15 vols. Ed. Alexander B. Grosart. New York: Russell & Russell, 1964. 11:41-104.

--. "A Disputation betweene a Hee Conny-catcher, and a Shee Conny-catcher, whether a Theefe or a Whoore, is most hurtfull in Cousonage, to the Common-wealth." *The Life and Complete Works in Prose and Verse of Robert Greene.* 15 vols. Ed. Alexander B. Grosart. New York: Russell & Russell, 1964. 10:195-278.

--. "Menaphon." *Menaphon by Robert Greene and A Margarite of America by Thomas Lodge.* Ed. G. B. Harrison. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1927. 1-108.

--. "A Notable Discovery of Coosnage." *The Life and Complete Works in Prose and Verse of Robert Greene.* 15 vols. Ed. Alexander B. Grosart. New York: Russell & Russell, 1964. 10:3-61.

--. "Pandosto. The Triumph of Time." *An Anthology of Elizabethan Prose Fiction.* Ed. Paul Salzman. Oxford, New York: Oxford UP, 1987. 151-204.

--. "The Second Part of Connie-catching. *The Life and Complete Works in Prose and Verse of Robert Greene.* 15 vols. Ed. Alexander B. Grosart. New York: Russell & Russell, 1964. 10:65-133.

--. "The Thirde and last Part of Conny-catching. *The Life and Complete Works in Prose and Verse of Robert Greene.* 15 vols. Ed. Alexander B. Grosart. New York: Russell & Russell, 1964. 10:137-92.

Griffin, Bartholomew. "Fidessa: More Chaste Than Kind." *Elizabethan Sonnet-Cycles.* Ed. Martha Foote Crow. 4 vols. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1897. 3:77-138.

Halliday, W. R. "Introduction." *A Short Treatise of Hunting 1591*. By Thomas Cockayne. [London]: Published for Shakespeare Association by Humphrey Milford, Oxford UP, 1932. v-xix.

Hanawalt, Barbara A. "Men's games, king's deer: poaching in medieval England." *The Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 18 (1988): 175-93.

A Handefull of Pleasant Delites. [Manchester]: Printed for Spenser Society [by C. S. Sims], 1871. New York: Burt Franklin, 1967.

Hardy, Thomas. *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*. Ed. Tim Dolin. London: Penguin 1998.

Harington, John. "An apology for Ariosto: poetry, epic, morality." *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*. Ed. Brian Vickers. Oxford: Clarendon P; Oxford, New York: Oxford UP, 1999. 302-24.

Harrington, Susan Marie and Michal Nahor Bond. " 'Good Sir, Be Ruld by Me:' Patterns of Domination and Manipulation in Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*." *Studies in Short Fiction* 24 (1987): 243-50.

Harrison, William. *The Description of England*. Ed. Georges Edelen. Ithaca: Published for the Folger Shakespeare Library by Cornell UP, 1968.

Hart, Cyril. *The Verderers and Forest Laws of Dean*. Newton Abbot:

David & Charles, 1971.

Hart, Jonathan. "Narrational Strategies in *The Rape of Lucrece.*" *SEL* 32 (1992): 59-77.

---. "'*Till Forging Nature Be Condemned of Treason*': Representational Strike in *Venus and Adonis.*" *Cahiers Elizabethains* 36 (1989): 37-47.

Hart, J. S. "Shakespeare's Minor Poems: *Venus and Adonis.*" Venus and Adonis: *Critical Essays*. Ed. Philip C. Kolin. New York: Garland, 1997. 77-8.

Hartman, Herbert. Introduction. *A Petite Pallace of Pettie His Pleasure*. By George Pettie. [Oxford]: Oxford UP, 1938. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1960. ix-xvii.

Haynes, Jonathan. *The Social Relations of Jonson's Theatre*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.

Heathcote, Owen. "Jobs for the Boys? Or: What's New About the Male Hunter in Duvert, Guibert and Jourdan?" *Gay Signatures: Gay and Lesbian Theory, Fiction and Film in France, 1945-1995*. Ed. Owen Heathcote, Alex Hughes and James S. Williams. Oxford, New York: Berg, 1998. 173-91.

Helgerson, Richard. "Murder in Faversham: Holinshed's Impertinent History." *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: History, Rhetoric, and Fiction, 1500-1800*. Ed. Donald R. Kelley and David Harris Sacks. New York: Woodrow Wilson Center P and Cambridge UP, 1997. 133-58.

Heninger, S. K., Jr. Introduction. *The Hekatompathia or Passionate Centurie of Love*. By Thomas Watson. Gainesville: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1964. v-xviii.

Heywood, John. "A defence of drama." *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*. Ed. Brian Vickers. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1999. 475-501.

--. "A Woman Killed with Kindness." *Renaissance Drama: An Anthology of Plays and Entertainments*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Malden, Mass: Blackwell, 1999. 294-325.

Hoby, Margaret. *The Private Life of An Elizabethan Lady: The Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby 1599-1605*. Ed. Joanna Moody. Stroud, Gloucestershire: Sutton, 1998.

The Holy Bible. King James Version. Oxford: Oxford UP, [n.d.].

Hore, J. P. *The History of The Royal Buckhorns*. London: Remington, 1893.

Hoskyns, John. "Sidney's *Arcadia* and the rhetoric of English prose (c.1599)." *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*. Ed. Brian Vickers. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1999. 398-427.

Howard, Henry. "A song written by the earle of Surrey by a lady that refused to daunce with him." Tottel's *Miscellany (1557-1587)*. Ed. Hyder Edward Rollins. Rev. ed. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1965. 1:207-9.

--. "The lover describes his restlesse state." Tottel's *Miscellany (1557-1587)*. Ed. Hyder Edward Rollins. Rev. ed. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1965. 1:23.

Hughes, Ted. *Selected Poems, 1957-1994*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 2002.

Hull, Elizabeth M. "All My Deed But Copying Is: The Erotics of Identity in *Astrophil and Stella*." *Texas Studies In Literature and Language* 38 (1996): 175-90.

Hunter, G. K. "Bourgeois Comedy: Shakespeare and Dekker." *Shakespeare and His Contemporaries: Essays in Comparison*. Ed. E. A. J. Honingman. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1986. 1-15.

James I. *Basilicon Doron 1599*. Menston: Scolar P, 1969.

Jardine, M. D. "New Historicism for Old: New Conservatism for Old?: The Politics of Patronage in the Renaissance." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (1991): 286-304.

J. C. Introduction. *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites*. [Manchester]: Printed for The Spenser Society [by C. S. Sims], 1871. New York: Burt Franklin, 1967. iii-vi.

Jones, Norman. " Shakespeare's England." *A Companion to Shakespeare*. Ed. David Scott Kastan. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999. 25-42.

Jonson, Ben. "Bartholomew Fair." *Renaissance Drama: An Anthology of Plays and Entertainments*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Malden, Mass: Blackwell, 1999. 490-555.

--. *Epicoene or The Silent Woman*. Ed. L. A. Beaurline. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1966.

--. *Every Man in His Humour: A Parallel-Text Edition of the 1601 Quarto and the 1616 Folio*. Ed. J.W. Lever. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1971.

--. "Sejanus." *Ben Jonson*. Ed. C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson. 11 v. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1925-52. 4:349-470.

--. *Volpone*. Ed. Alvin B. Kernan. New Haven: Yale UP, 1962.

Joscelyne, Trevor. " 'Money buys lands, and wives are sold by fate': Characterization by Culture and Gender in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*." *Discourse and Character*. Ed. Wojciech Kalaga and Tadeusz Slawek. Katowice, Poland: Uniwersytet Slaski, 1990. 56-75.

Kawachi, Yoshiko. *Calendar of English Renaissance Drama 1558-1642*. New York: Garland, 1986.

Keller, James R. "Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveler:* Taming the Spirit of Discontent." *Elizabethan Review* 1 (1993): 7-17.

Kelso, Ruth. *The Doctrine of the English Gentleman in the Sixteenth Century*. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1964.

Kermode, Frank. "*Titus Andronicus.*" *The Riverside Shakespeare*. 2nd ed. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1997. 1065-8.

Kinney, Arthur F. Introduction. *Rogues, Vagabonds & Sturdy Beggars*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Barre, Mass.: Imprint Society, 1973. 11-57.

--. Introduction to "Arden of Faversham." *Renaissance Drama: An Anthology of Plays and Entertainments*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Malden, Mass: Blackwell, 1999. 97-100.

--. Introduction to "Bartholomew Fair" *Renaissance Drama: An Anthology of Plays and Entertainments*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Malden, Mass: Blackwell, 1999. 483-9.

--. Introduction to "The Spanish Tragedy." *Renaissance Drama: An Anthology of Plays and Entertainments*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Malden, Mass: Blackwell, 1999. 47-52.

Kinney, Clare R. "Feigning Female Faining: Spenser, Lodge, Shakespeare, and Rosalind." *Modern Philology* 95 (1998): 291-315.

--. "Mary Wroth's Guilty 'secrett art:' The Poetics of Jealousy in *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus*." *Write or Be Written: Early Modern Women Poets and Cultural Constraints*. Ed. Barbara Smith and Ursula Appelt. Aldershot, England, Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2001. 69-85.

Knapp, Peggy. "Ben Jonson and the Publicke Riot: Ben Jonson's Comedies." *Staging the Renaissance: Reinterpretations of Elizabethan and*

Jacobean Drama. Ed. David Scott Kastan and Peter Stallybrass. New York: Routledge, 1991. 164-80.

Kulisheck, Patricia Jo. " 'Every Body Does Not Hunt'. " *Persuasions* 8 (1986): 20-4.

Kyd, Thomas. "The Spanish Tragedy." *Renaissance Drama: An Anthology of Plays and Entertainments*. Ed. Arthur F. Kinney. Malden, Mass: Blackwell, 1999. 52-93.

Lanier, Aemelia. See Lanyer, Aemilia.

Lanyer, Aemilia. "The Description of Cooke-Ham." *Women Poets of the Renaissance*. Ed. Marion Wynne-Davies. New York: Routledge, 1999, 1998. 148-53.

Laughlin, William S. "Hunting: An Integrating Biobehavior System and Its Evolutionary Importance." *Man the Hunter*. Ed. Richard B. Lee and Irven DeVore. New York: Aldine De Gruyter, 1968. 304-20.

Leyton, Elliott. *Hunting Humans: The Rise of the Modern Multiple Murderer*. Toronto: McCelland and Stewart, 1986.

"Like desart woods, with darksome shades obscured." *The Phoenix Nest 1593*. Ed. Hyder Edwards Rollins. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1969. 67.

Lodge, Thomas. "A Margarite of America." *Menaphon by Robert Greene and A Margarite of America by Thomas Lodge*. Ed. G. B. Harrison. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1927. 109-226.

--. "Phillis: Honored with Pastoral Sonnets, Elegies, and Amorous Delights." *Elizabethan Sonnet-Cycles*. Ed. Martha Foote Crow. 4 vols. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1896. 1:61.

--. *Rosalind: Euphues' Golden Legacy Found After His Death in His Cell at Silexedra (1590)*. Ed. Donald Beecher. Ottawa: Dovehouse Editions, 1997.

"The Lover compareth him self to the painful Falconer." *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites*. [Manchester]: Printed for Spenser Society [by C. S. Sims], 1871. New York: Burt Franklin, 1967. 71-2.

Lovett, Robert Morss and Helen Sard Hughes. *The History of the Novel in England*. Boston, New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1932.

Low, Anthony. *The Reinvention of Love: Poetry, Politics, and Culture from Sidney to Milton*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge UP, 1993.

Luckyj, Christina. Introduction. *The White Devil*. By John Webster. Ed. Christina Luckyj. London: A. & C. Black; New York: W. W. Norton, 1996. ix-xxx.

Lyly, John. "Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit." *An Anthology of Elizabethan Prose Fiction*. Ed. Paul Salzman. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987. 83-150.

MacDonald, Hugh. Introduction. *Englands Helicon edited from the edition of 1600 with additional poems from the edition of 1614*. Ed. Hugh MacDonald. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1949. xv-xxii.

Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince*. Trans. George Bull. London: Penguin, 1981.

MacKenzie, John M. *The Empire of Nature: Hunting, Conservation and British Imperialism*. Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 1988.

Manning, Roger B. *Hunters and Poachers: A Social and Cultural History of Unlawful Hunting in England, 1485-1640*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1993.

Marenco, Franco. "Double Plot in Sidney's Old 'Arcadia'." *Modern Language Review* 64 (1969): 248-63.

Margolies, David. *Novel and Society in Elizabethan England*. Totowa, N. J.: Barnes & Noble, 1985.

M[arkham], G[ervase]. *Country Contentments: Or, The Husbandmans Recreations*. 7th ed. London: E. Brewster and George Sawbridge, 1654.

Markham, Gervase. *The English Housewife*. Ed. Michael R. Best. Kingston: McGill-Queen's UP, 1986.

Marlowe, Christopher. "Dido Queen of Carthage." *Dido Queen of Carthage* and *The Massacre at Paris*. Ed. H. J. Oliver. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1968. 1-90.

--. "The Massacre at Paris." *Dido Queen of Carthage* and *The Massacre at Paris*. Ed. H. J. Oliver. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1968. 91-163.

--. *Tamburlaine: Parts One and Two*. Ed. Anthony B. Dawson. 2nd ed. London: A & C Black; New York: W. W. Norton, 1997.

Marotti, Arthur F. " 'Love is not love': Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences and the Social Order." *ELH* 49 (1982): 396-428.

Marshall, Rosalind K. "The Queen's Table." *Tools and Traditions: Studies in European Ethnology Presented to Alexander Fenton*. Ed. Hugh Cheape and Alexander Fenton. [Edinburgh]: National Museums of Scotland, 1993. 139-43.

Martines, Lauro. *Society and History in English Renaissance Verse*. New York: Basil Blackwell, 1985.

Meloy, J. Reid. "The Psychology of Stalking." *The Psychology of Stalking: Clinical and Forensic Perspectives*. Ed. J. Reid Meloy. San Diego: Academic P, 1998. 1-23.

Merrix, Robert P. " 'Lo, In This Hollow Cradle Take Thy Rest:' Sexual Conflict and Resolution in *Venus and Adonis*." Venus and Adonis: *Critical Essays*. Ed. Philip C. Kolin. New York: Garland, 1997. 341-58.

Middleton, Thomas and Thomas Dekker. *The Roaring Girl*. Ed. Andor Gomme. London: Ernest Benn. New York: W. W. Norton, 1976.

Mish, Charles C. Introduction. *Short Fiction of the Seventeenth Century*. Ed. Charles C. Mish. New York: W. W. Norton, 1963. vii-xvii.

-. Introduction to "Cawwood the Rook." *Short Fiction of the Seventeenth Century*. Ed. Charles C. Mish. New York: W. W. Norton, 1963. 341-2.

--. Introduction to "Don Juan and Marsillia". *Short Fiction of the Seventeenth Century*. Ed. Charles C. Mish. New York: W. W. Norton, 1963. 195-7.

--. Introduction to "The Tinker of Turvey." *Short Fiction of the Seventeenth Century*. Ed. Charles C. Mish. New York: W. W. Norton, 1963. 117-8.

Morgan, Charlotte E. *The Rise of the Novel of Manners: A Study of English Prose Fiction Between 1600 and 1740*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1963, 1939.

Moryson, Fynes. *Shakespeare's Europe: A Survey of the Condition of Europe at the end of the Sixteenth Century. Being Unpublished Chapters of Fynes Moryson's* Itinerary *(1617)*. London 1903. 2nd ed. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1967.

Moulton, Ian Frederick. *Before Pornography: Erotic Writing in Early Modern England*. Oxford, New York: Oxford UP, 2000.

Nashe, Thomas. "The Unfortunate Traveller." *The Unfortunate Traveller and Other Works*. Ed. J. B. Steane. London: Penguin, 1985. 251-370.

Neill, Michael. *Putting History to the Question: Power, Politics, and Society in English Renaissance Drama*. New York: Columbia UP, 2000.

Nelson, Jeffrey N. Introduction. *The Poetry of Robert Tofte 1597-1620*. Ed.

Jeffrey N. Nelson. New York: Garland, 1994. vii-xxxvii.

Newcomb, Lori Humphrey. "The Romance of Service: The Simple History of *Pandosto's* Servant Readers." *Framing Elizabethan Fictions: Contemporary Approaches to Early Modern Narrative Prose.* Ed. Constance C. Relihan. Kent, Ohio: Kent State UP, 1996. 117-39.

Newman, Karen. "City Talk: Women and Commodification in *Epicoene* (1609)." *Staging the Renaissance: Reinterpretations of Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama.* Ed. David Scott Kastan and Peter Stallybrass. New York: Routledge, 1991. 181-95.

Nichols, John. *The Progresses, Processions and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First.* 4 vols. London, 1828. New York: Burt Franklin [1967?].

--. *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth.* 3 vols. London: Printed by and for the editor. Printer Society of Antiquaries of London, 1788.

Norbrook, David. "Rhetoric, Ideology and the Elizabethan World Picture." *Renaissance Rhetoric.* Ed. Peter Mack. New York: St. Martin's P, 1994. 140-64.

"A Nosegaie alwaies sweet ...." *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites.* [Manchester]: Printed for Spenser Society [by C. S. Sims], 1871. New York: Burt Franklin, 1967. 3-7.

Okerlund, Arlene N. "The Rhetoric of Love: Voice in the *Amoretti* and the *Songs and Sonets*." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 68 (1982): 37-46.

Orme, Nicholas. "Medieval Hunting: Fact and Fancy." *Chaucer's England: Literature in Historical Content*. Ed. Barbara A. Hanawalt. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1992. 133-53.

Ortega y Gasset, José. *Meditations on Hunting*. Trans. Howard B. Wescott. New York: Charles Scriber's Sons, 1972.

Osborne, Francis. *Historical Memoires on the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth, and King James*. London, 1658.

Ovid. "Cures for Love." *The Erotic Poems*. Trans. Peter Green. London: Penguin, 1982. 239-63.

--. *The Metaphorphoses of Ovid*. Trans. Mary M. Innes. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1955.

--. *The Remedies of Love*. See "Cures for Love."

Oxford English Dictionary. 2nd ed. CD-ROM. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992.

Parker, Patricia. *Literary Fat Ladies: Rhetoric, Gender, Property*. London, New York: Methuen, 1987.

Parker, R. B. "Volpone *and* Reynard the Fox." *Renaissance Drama* 7 (1976): 3-42.

Partridge, Eric. *Shakespeare's bawdy: a literary and psychological essay and a comprehensive glossary*. Rev. and enlarged edition. London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1968.

Peacham, Henry. "From *The Garden of Eloquence.*" *Renaissance Debates on Rhetoric.* Ed. and Trans. Wayne A. Rebhorn. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2000. 224-32.

Pearson, Lu Emily. *Elizabethan Love Conventions*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1966, 1933.

Peele, George. "Colin the enamoured Sheepheard, singeth this passion of love." *Englands Helicon edited from the edition of 1600 with additional poems from the edition of 1614*. Ed. Hugh MacDonald. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1949. 204-5.

Pendry, E. D. Introduction. *Thomas Dekker:* The Wonderful Year, The Gull's Horn-Book, Penny-Wise, Pound Foolish, English Villainies Discovered by Lantern and Candlelight *and Selected Writings*. Ed. E. D. Pendry. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1968. 1-22.

Perkins, David. "Wordsworth and the Polemic against Hunting: 'Hart-Leap Well.'" *Nineteenth Century Literature* 52 (1998): 421-45.

Pettie, George. *A Petite Pallace of Pettie His Pleasure*. Ed. Herbert Hartman. [Oxford]: Oxford UP, 1938. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1960.

The Phoenix Nest 1593. Ed. Hyder Edwards Rollins. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1969.

Pigman, G. W. Biographical Introduction. *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*. By George Gascoigne. Ed. G. W. Pigman. Oxford: Clarendon P, 2000. xxiii-xliii.

--. Commentary on *A Discourse of the Adventures Passed by Master F. J. A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*. Ed. G. W. Pigman III. Oxford: Clarendon P; New York: Oxford UP, 2000. 548-96.

Plantagenet, Edward. *The Master of Game, the Oldest English Book of Hunting*. New York: AMS P, 1973, 1909.

Platt, Peter G. "Shakespeare and Rhetorical Culture." *A Companion to Shakespeare*. Ed. David Scott Kastan. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1999. 277-96.

"The Pleasant History of Cawwood the Rooke." *Short Fiction of the Seventeenth Century*. Ed. Charles C. Mish. New York: W. W. Norton, 1963. 342-63.

Pollard, A. W. and G. R. Redgrave, eds. *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640*. London: The Bibliographical Society, 1926. Charlotteville: Bibliographical Society of U of Virginia Library, 1961.

Preussner, Arnold. "The Actaeon Myth in Ovid, Petrarch, Wyatt, and Sidney." *Bestia* 5 (1993): 95-108.

Price, Hereward T. "Function of Imagery in *Venus and Adonis*." Venus and Adonis: *Critical Essays*. Ed. Philip C. Kolin. New York: Garland, 1997. 107-22.

"A proper Sonet, Intituled, Maid, wil you marrie." *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites*. [Manchester]: Printed for Spenser Society [by C. S. Sims], 1871. New York: Burt Franklin, 1967. 39-43.

"A proper sonet, wherin the Lover dolefully sheweth his grief to his L. & requireth pity." *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites*. [Manchester]: Printed for Spenser Society [by C. S. Sims], 1871. New York: Burt Franklin, 1967. 22-5.

Puttenham, George. *The Arte of English Poesie*.

--. "English poetics and rhetoric (1589)." *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*. Ed. Brian Vickers. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1999. 190-296.

Rackin, Phyllis. "Historical Difference/Sexual Difference." *Privileging Gender in Early Modern England*. Ed. Jean R. Brink. Kirksville, Mo.: Sixteenth Century Publishers, 1993. 37-63.

Radway, Janice A. *Reading the Romance: Women, Patriarchy and Popular Culture*. 2nd ed. Chappel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1991.

Raines, F. R. "Introduction." *The Journal of Nicholas Assheton, of Downham, in the Country of Lancaster, Esq., for Part of the year 1617, and following* by Nicholas Assheton. Ed. F. R. Raines.

Chetham Society, 1848. London, New York: Johnson Reprint 1968. iii-xxx.

Relihan, Constance C. "Introduction: Framing Elizabethan Fictions." *Framing Elizabethan Fictions: Contemporary Approaches to Early Modern Narrative Prose*. Ed. Constance C. Relihan. Kent: Kent State UP, 1996. 1-15.

--. "The Narrative Strategies of Robert Greene's Cony-Catching Pamphlets." *Cahiers Elisabethains* 37 (1990): 9-15.

--. "Rhetoric, Gender, and Audience Construction in Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*." *Framing Elizabethan Fictions: Contemporary Approaches to Early Modern Narrative Prose*. Ed. Constance C. Relihan. Kent: Kent State UP, 1996. 141-52.

Reynolds, John. "Don Juan and Marsillia." *Short Fiction of the Seventeenth Century*. Ed. Charles C. Mish. New York: W. W. Norton, 1963. 193-234.

Richards, I. A. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. New York, London: Oxford UP, 1936.

Roberts, Josephine A. Commentary. *The First Part of The Countess of Montgomery's Urania*. By Mary Wroth. Ed. Josephine A. Roberts. Binghamton: Center for Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, State University of New York at Binghamton, 1995. 715-803.

--. Textual Introduction. *The First Part of The Countess of Montgomery's*

Urania. By Mary Wroth. Ed. Josephine A. Roberts. Binghamton: Center for Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, State University of New York at Binghamton, 1995. cv-cxx.

Roberts, Josephine A. and Margaret P. Hannay. "Lady Mary Wroth." *Teaching Tudor and Stuart Women Writers*. Ed. Susanne Woods and Margaret P. Hannay. New York: Modern Language Association, 2000. 145-54.

Roberts. Katherine. *Fair Ladies: Sir Philip Sidney's Female Characters*. New York: Peter Lang, 1993.

Robinson, Clement. *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites*. [Manchester]: Printed for Spenser Society [by C. S. Sims], 1871. New York: Burt Franklin, 1967.

Robinson, Forrest G. *The Shape of Things Known: Sidney's Apology in its Philosophical Tradition*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1972.

Roe, John. "Notes." *The Poems: Venus and Adonis, The Rape of Lucrece, The Phoenix and the Turtle, The Passionate Pilgrim, A Lover's Complaint*. Ed. John Roe. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge UP, 1992.

Rollins, Hyder Edward. Introduction. *The Phoenix Nest 1593*. Ed. Hyder Edwards Rollins. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1969. ix-xliii.

--. Introduction. Tottel's *Miscellany (1557-1587)*. Ed. Hyder Edward Rollins. Rev. ed. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1965. 2:3-124.

--. Notes. Tottel's *Miscellany (1557-1587)*. Ed. Hyder Edward Rollins. Rev. ed. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1965. 2:127-341.

Rooney, Anne. *Hunting in Middle English Literature*. Suffolk, UK, Rochester: Boydell P, 1993.

Rothstein, Eric. "Discordia *Non Concors:* The Motif of Hunting in Eighteenth-Century Verse." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 83 (1984): 330-54.

Salzman, Paul. Introduction. *An Anthology of Elizabethan Prose Fiction*. Oxford, New York: Oxford UP, 1987. vii-xxiv.

Saunders, Corinne J. "Introduction." *The Forest of Medieval Romance: Avernus, Broceliande, Arden*. Cambridge, Rochester, NY: D. S. Brewer, 1993. ix-xiii.

Seaver, Paul S. "Thomas Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday: The Artisanal World.*" *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre and Politics in London 1576-1649*. Ed. David L. Smith, Richard Stier and David Bevington. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge UP, 1995. 87-116.

Shakespeare, William. "As You Like It." *The Riverside Shakespeare*. 2nd ed. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1997. 403-34.

--. "Love's Labor's Lost." *The Riverside Shakespeare*. 2nd ed. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1997. 213-46.

--. "The Merry Wives of Windsor." *The Riverside Shakespeare*. 2nd ed. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1997. 324-56.

--. "The Rape of Lucrece." *The Riverside Shakespeare*. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997. 1816-36.

--. "Sonnets." *The Riverside Shakespeare*. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997. 1843-71.

--. "The Taming of the Shrew." *The Riverside Shakespeare*. 2nd ed. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1997. 142-71.

--. "The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark." *The Riverside Shakespeare*. 2nd ed. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1997. 1189-1234.

--. "The Tragedy of Julius Caesar." *The Riverside Shakespeare*. 2nd ed. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1997. 1151-78.

--. "The Tragedy of Macbeth." *The Riverside Shakespeare*. 2nd ed. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1997. 1360-87.

--. "The Tragedy of Titus Andronicus." *The Riverside Shakespeare*. 2nd ed. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1997. 1069-96.

--. "Venus and Adonis." *The Riverside Shakespeare*. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997. 1799-1812.

"The Sheepheards slumber." *Englands Helicon edited from the edition of 1600 with additional poems from the edition of 1614*. Ed. Hugh MacDonald. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1949. 186-9.

Shelley, Percy. "On the Game Laws." *The Prose Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley.* 2 vols. Ed. E. B. Murray. Oxford: Clarendon P; New York: Oxford UP, 1993. 1:280-1.

Sherwood, Roy. *The Court of Oliver Cromwell.* London: Croom Helm; Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1977.

Shirley, James. *A Critical Edition of James Shirley's* The Lady of Pleasure. Ed. Marilyn J. Thorssen. New York: Garland, 1980.

Sidney, Philip. "Astrophil and Stella." *Selected Writings.* By Philip Sidney. Ed. Richard Dutton. Manchester: Carcanet P, 1987. 29-101.

--. *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (The Old Arcadia).* 2nd ed. Ed. Katherine Duncan Jones. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1994.

--. *The Defence of Poesie 1595.* Menston: Scolar P, 1968.

Skoler, Glen. "Was Shakespeare A Stalker?: A Modern Psychodynamic Interpretation of the Dark Lady Sonnets." *The Psychology of Stalking: Clinical and Forensic Perspectives.* Ed. J. Reid Meloy. San Diego: Academic P, 1998. 88-112.

Smith, Hallet. "Sonnets." *The Riverside Shakespeare.* 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997. 1839-42.

Somerset, Alan. "New Historicism: Old History Writ Large? Carnival, Festivity and Popular Culture in the West Midlands." *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 5 (1991): 245-55.

Songes and sonettes written by the ryght honourable Lorde Henry Haward late Earle of Surrey, and other. See Tottel's *Miscellany*.

Spenser, Edmund. "Amoretti." *Selected Shorter Poems*. By Edmund Spencer. Ed. Douglas Brooks-Davies. New York: Longman, 1995. 214-85.

---. "Perigot and Cuddies Roundelay." *Englands Helicon edited from the edition of 1600 with additional poems from the edition of 1614*. Ed. Hugh MacDonald. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1949. 20-2.

Stagg, D. J. "Preface." *Calendar of New Forest Documents: The Fifteenth to the Seventeenth Centuries*. Ed. D. J. Stagg. [Winchester]: Hampshire Record Office for Hampshire Country Council, 1983. vii-xi.

Stephens, Dorothy. *The Limits of Eroticism in Post-Petrarchan Narrative: Conditional Pleasure from Spenser to Marvell*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge UP, 1998.

Stone, Lawrence and Jeanne Fawtier-Stone. *An Open Elite? England 1540-1880*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1984.

Stuart, Arbella. *The Letters of Lady Arbella Stuart*. Ed. Sara Jayne Steen. New York: Oxford UP, 1994.

Thiebaux, Marcelle. "The Mouth of the Boar as a Symbol in Medieval Literature." *Romance Philology*22 (1968): 281-99.

--. *The Stag of Love: The Chase in Medieval Literature.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1974.

Thomas, Keith. *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500-1800.* London: Allen Lane, 1983.

Thynne, Maria. "Maria to Thomas Thynne." *Lay by Your Needles Ladies, Take the Pen: Writing Women in England, 1500-1700.* Ed. Suzanne Trill and Kate Chedgzoy, Melanie Osborne. London, New York: Arnold, 1997. 76-7.

Tilley, Christopher. *Metaphor and Material Culture.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.

Tillyard, E. M. W. *The Elizabethan World Picture.* London: Chatto & Windus, 1948.

"The Tinker of Turvey." *Short Fiction of the Seventeenth Century.* Ed. Charles C. Mish. New York: W. W. Norton, 1963. 115-91.

Tofte, Robert. "Alba." *The Poetry of Robert Tofte 1597-1620.* Ed. Jeffrey N. Nelson. New York: Garland, 1994. 72-209.

--. "Laura." *The Poetry of Robert Tofte 1597-1620.* Ed. Jeffrey N. Nelson. New York: Garland, 1994. 1-72.

Tottel's *Miscellany (1557-1587).* Ed. Hyder Edward Rollins. Rev. ed. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1965.

Tricomi, Albert H. *Reading Tudor-Stuart Texts Through Cultural Historicism.* Gainesville: UP of Florida, 1996.

Turberville, George. See Gascoigne, George.

Turner, Victor. *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Actions in Human Society.* Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1974.

Vandervell, Anthony and Charles Coles. *Game and the English Landscape: The Influence of the Chase on Sporting Art and Scenery.* London: Debrett's Peerage, 1980.

Van Ghent, Dorothy. *The English Novel: Form and Function.* New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1953.

Vickers, Brian. Introduction. *English Renaissance Literary Criticism.* Ed. Brian Vickers. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1999. 1-55.

--. "Shakespeare's Use of Rhetoric." *A New Companion to Shakespeare Studies.* Ed. Kenneth Muir and S. Schoenbaum. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1971. 83-98.

Villeponteaux, Mary A. " 'With her own will beguyld': The Captive Lady in Spenser's *Amoretti.*" *Explorations in Renaissance Culture* 14 (1988): 29-39.

Watson, Thomas. *The Hekatompathia or Passionate Centurie of Love.* Spenser Society, 1871. New York: Burt Franklin, 1967.

--. "The Sheepheards allusion of his owne amorous infelicitie, to the offence of Actaeon." *Englands Helicon edited from the edition of 1600 with additional poems from the edition of 1614*. Ed. Hugh MacDonald. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1949. 56.

Webster, John. *The White Devil*. Ed. Christina Luckyj. London: A. & C. Black; New York: W. W. Norton, 1996.

Wellwood, James. *Memoirs of the Most Material Transactions in England for The Last Hundred Years, Preceeding the Revolution in 1688*. 3rd ed. London, 1700.

Whelan, P. T. "The Hunting Metaphor in *The Fox* and Other Works." *The D.H. Lawrence Review* 21 (1989): 275-90.

Whissell, Cynthia. "The Formula Behind Women's Romantic Formula Fiction." *Arachné* 5 (1998): 89-119.

Whitney, Geoffrey. "Voluptas aerumnosa." *A Choice of Emblemes 1586*. Menston: Scolar P, 1969. 15.

Wiessner, Polly. "Leveling the Hunter: Constraints on the Status Quest in Foraging Societies." *Food and the Status Quest: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Ed. Polly Wiessner and Wulf Schiefenhövel. Providence, Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1996. 171-91.

Willbern, David. "Rape, Writing, Hyperbole: Shakespeare's Lucrece." *Compromise Formations: Current Directions in Psychoanalytic*

Criticism. Ed. Vera J. Camden. Kent, Ohio: Kent State UP, 1989. 182-98.

Williams, Gordon. *A Glossary of Shakespeare's Sexual Language*. London and Atlantic Highlands, N. J.: Athlone P, 1997.

Winwood, Ralph. *Memorials of Affairs of State in The Reigns of Q. Elizabeth and K. James I.* 3 vols. London: T. Ward, 1725.

Woodbridge, Linda. *Women, and the English Renaissance: Literature and the Nature of Womankind, 1540-1620*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1984.

Woods, Paula M. "Greene's Conny-Catching Courtesans: The Moral Ambiguity of Prostitution." *Explorations in Renaissance Culture* 28 (1992): 111-24.

Wordsworth, William. "Hart-Leap Well." *Poems*. Ed. John O. Hayden. 2 vols. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977. 1:415-21

Wroth, Mary. *The First Part of The Countess of Montgomery's Urania*. Ed. Josephine A. Roberts. Binghamton: Center for Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1995.

--. *The Poems of Lady Mary Wroth*. Ed. Josephine A. Roberts. Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State UP, 1983.

Wyatt, Thomas. "[W]hether libertie by losse of life, or life in prison and thraldome be to be preferred." Tottel's *Miscellany (1557-1587)*. Ed. Hyder Edward Rollins. Rev. ed. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1965. 1:213.